EURIPIDEA TERTIA

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H. S. VERSNEL

D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P. H. SCHRIJVERS

S.R. SLINGS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM QUADRAGESIMUM

DAVID KOVACS

EURIPIDEA TERTIA

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

EURIPIDEA TERTIA

BY

DAVID KOVACS

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2003

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ;
Boston : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
240. Kovacs, D : Euripidea tertia

Euripidea tertia / David Kovacs – Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2003
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 240)
ISBN 90–04–12977–4

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 12977 4

© Copyright 2003 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface vii

Abbreviations ix

Iphigenia Taurica 1

Ion 13

Helena 24

Phoenissae 48

Orestes 72

Bacchae 111

Iphigenia Aulidensis 137

Rhesus 145

Addendum: Cyclops 150

Addendum: Alcestis 153

Addendum: Medea 154

Addendum: Heraclidae 157

Addendum: Hecuba 162

Addendum: Supplices 164

Addendum: Heracles 168

Addendum: Troades 172

Indices
Index of Subjects 189
Index of Greek Words 189
Index of Passages Cited 190

PREFACE

This volume, like its two predecessors, *Euripidea* (Leiden, 1994) and *Euripidea Altera* (Leiden, 1996), is a companion to the Loeb Euripides, explaining some of the readings I adopt on the left-hand pages and some of my translations on the right-hand ones. The present volume covers the end of Loeb volume four and the whole of volumes five and six (*Iphigenia in Tauris, Ion, Helen, Phoenissae, Orestes, Bacchae, Iphigenia Aulidensis, Rhesus*). As I did in the earlier volumes, I have intercalated references to earlier discussions of mine. Unless otherwise noted, the lemmata at the head of the discussions and any apparatus is Diggle's, whose text makes the most convenient point of departure. I have incorporated his later corrections (see his *Euripidea* 518-23) into the apparatus.

There are, as before, debts to acknowledge. Parts of this book were written during a year of full-time research in 1996-7 made possible by a grant from the Division of Research of the National Endowment for the Humanities. I am grateful to the Endowment for supporting this unfashionable and un-trendy kind of research. I am also grateful to the Master and Fellows of Balliol College, Oxford for electing me to a Visiting Fellowship for that year, which allowed me to spend twelve months in close proximity to several people who have edited or otherwise explicated tragedy with credit. I am particularly grateful to Jasper Griffin, Martin West, Charles Willink, James Diggle, and Chris Pelling for *viva voce* discussion or useful written comment. Martin West invited me to join him in teaching a seminar on *Iphigenia Aulidensis* in Hilary Term of 1997, and I thank him and the other participants for lively discussion of the many problems of that play.

A second period of work on the text was 2000-1, when I received a semester's leave from the University of Virginia and was elected to a Visiting Fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge. I am immensely grateful to the Master and Fellows for their kindness and generosity. I benefited enormously from discussions with Roger Dawe, James

Diggle, Eric Handley, and Charles Willink. For help on particular chapters at a still later stage I am grateful to John Gibert and Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Naturally, none of those named are implicated in my errors.

Charlottesville, Virginia

ABBREVIATIONS

Ancient authors and works are abbreviated as in LSJ, periodicals as in *L'année philologique*, and metrical symbols as in M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982).

Denniston, *GP*	J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*[2] (Oxford, 1959)
Diggle, *Studies*	J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981)
Diggle, *Euripidea*	J. Diggle, *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1994)
Erbse, *Studien*	H. Erbse, *Studien zum Prolog der euripideischen Tragödie* (Berlin and New York, 1984)
Euripidea	D. Kovacs, *Euripidea* (Leiden, 1994)
Euripidea Altera	D. Kovacs, *Euripidea Altera* (Leiden, 1996)
Jackson, *MS*	J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955)
K.-G.	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover and Leipzig, 1898)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, , *A Greek-English Lexicon,* 9th ed. rev. by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie (Oxford, 1940 et seq.)
Page, *GLP*	D. L. Page, *Select Papyri III: Literary Papyri, Poetry* (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1941)
Page, *IA*	D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934)

Smyth — H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar,* revised by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass., 1956)

Stinton, *CPGT* — T. C. W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990)

Wilamowitz, *KS* — U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1962)

IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS[1]

34-41

ναοῖσι δ᾽ ἐν τοῖσδ᾽ ἱερέαν τίθησί με·
ὅθεν, νόμοισιν οἷσιν ἥδεται θεὰ
Ἄρτεμις, ἑορτῆς (τοὔνομ᾽ ἧς καλὸν μόνον·
τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη)
[θύω γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει
ὃς ἂν κατέλθῃ τήνδε γῆν Ἕλλην ἀνήρ]
κατάρχομαι μέν, σφάγια δ᾽ ἄλλοισιν μέλει
[ἄρρητ᾽ ἔσωθεν τῶνδ᾽ ἀνακτόρων θεᾶς].

35 νόμοισιν οἷσιν Herwerden: νόμοισι τοῖσιδ᾽ <L>P: -σι τοῖσιν Tr^2 37 post 41 trai. Markland, del. (una cum 35-6 et 38-41) Faust 38-9 del. Murray (iam 38 del. Koechly, 38-41 Usener) 41 del. Monk cl. 66, 624; extra aedem fieri sacrificia colligitur e 72

This passage has been discussed by, among others, Stinton, *JHS* 97 (1977), 149-51 (=*CPGT* 304-7), Erbse, *Studien* 197-8, Sansone, *RhM* 121 (1978), 35-47 (here 36-9), and Diggle, *PCPS* 15 (1969), 56-9 (=his *Euripidea* 28-33), *Studies* 75-6. D.'s text is open to two objections, either of which is fatal. (1) D. deletes 38-9, but it is essential that the audience be told that it is the custom among the Taurians to sacrifice Greeks (i.e. foreigners). Otherwise they will be able to make no sense of the allusion in 54-5 and 72. Line 39 is indispensable. (2) D. takes κατάρχομαι with ἑορτῆς, 'I consecrate the festival'. But I know of no parallel for such an object with κατάρχομαι. Furthermore, if the audience are to understand 54-6 and 58, which allude to Iphigenia's consecrating of victims, they must be told that that is what she does, and κατάρχομαι must bear its usual sense 'consecrate for sacrifice'.

---

[1] Throughout the present work the abbreviation 'D.' will be used for James Diggle, whose contributions to Euripidean studies can scarcely be overestimated. In this chapter I refer by author's name to M. J. Cropp, *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris* (Warminster, 2000).

The passage, however, cannot be left to stand as transmitted: as D. says, it is 'a text of fits and starts, wherein the making of a promise in one line and the breaking of it in the next are introduced by a clumsy aposiopesis and ended by an inexplicable asyndeton'. Yet I suggest that if we accept Herwerden's νόμοισιν οἷσιν, as does D., and delete 38 and 41, we produce a text that reads clearly and whose corruption can be adequately explained.

> ναοῖσι δ' ἐν τοῖσδ' ἱερέαν τίθησί με·
> ὅθεν νόμοισιν οἷσιν ἥδεται θεὰ
> Ἄρτεμις ἑορτῆς, τοὔνομ' ἧς καλὸν μόνον
> (τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ, τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη),
> [θύω γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει]
> ὃς ἂν κατέλθῃ τήνδε γῆν Ἕλλην ἀνὴρ
> κατάρχομαι μέν, σφάγια δ' ἄλλοισιν μέλει
> [ἄρρητ' ἔσωθεν τῶνδ' ἀνακτόρων θεᾶς].

'In this temple she has made me priestess. And therefore in accordance with the custom in which the goddess Artemis delights, the custom of the feast whose name alone is fair (its other aspects I pass over in silence for fear of the goddess), I consecrate as victim any Greek who comes to this land, but the slaying is the concern of others.' In 35 ὅθεν is causal and explains that as a consequence of her appointment she carries out the duties the goddess requires, i.e. of consecrating victims. The corruption of νόμοισιν οἷσιν to L's νόμοισι τοῖσιδ' could have been caused by the τοῖσδ' in 34, as Sansone points out. The unusual position of ἑορτῆς, dependent on νόμοισιν but separated by an intervening relative clause, is caused by the unusual circumstance that both dative and genitive have relative clauses dependent on them, clauses which must be put where they are if they are to be intelligible.

D. is correct to say that τοὔνομ' ἧς καλὸν μόνον means that Iphigenia regards the designation 'festival' as misleading. As for her promise to say nothing of its other aspects, what she suppresses, for fear of the goddess, is not description but evaluation: the name 'festival', she says, is lovely, but I won't say how I would describe the sacrifices. Line 38 must go, not because it violates the promise but because it destroys the syntax. From 35 on we have been waiting

for the verb introduced by ὅθεν. The γὰρ in 38 would be yet a further interruption.[1] Eliminate it and we proceed by way of 39, which describes the understood object, to κατάρχομαι, the awaited verb: the objectionable asyndeton is no more. D. finds fault with κατέλθῃ ('come to land') in 39, but since he himself provides a Homeric parallel, the objection may not be weighty enough to set against the clear sense and Euripidean style that now shines forth from the passage.

Iphigenia thus deftly outlines what she does for the goddess. One reader, however, found the outline too inexplicit and was moved to insert a line in which she says *expressis verbis* that she sacrifices the Greeks in question. The author of 38 may have already have had a corrupted 35 before him, in which case he took ἥδεται as a main verb and τοισίδ' as prospective. His γὰρ thus made perfect sense to him, and he was not bothered by the asyndeton in 40.

Line 41 should probably be deleted as well: with 40 all that needs saying has been said, and 41 is inconsistent with 72, where the sacrifices are thought of as occurring at the altar visible in the orchestra. Just why anyone felt moved to add this line is hard to say.

77-9

Ορ. ὦ Φοῖβε, ποῖ μ' αὖ τήνδ' ἐς ἄρκυν ἤγαγες
χρήσας, ἐπειδὴ πατρὸς αἷμ' ἐτεισάμην
μητέρα κατακτάς;

'O Phoebus, whither have you brought me by your oracles *into this net* . . . ?' asks Orestes, seemingly answering his initial question in the course of asking it. We might suppose that ποῖ means 'for what purpose', but neither the main article nor the supplement in LSJ s.v.

---

[1] Erbse, *Studien* 297, makes ἥδεται into a main verb by taking οἷσιν not as a relative but as a posseessive pronoun. He cites *Med.* 955, ἐκγόνοισιν οἷς and adds a hopeful 'u.a.', but in Euripides that passage is the only *prima facie* candidate for possessive ὅς: see Page *ad loc.* and LSJ s.v. I find it impossible to imagine that *IT* 35 is an example, and I have doubts about the soundness of *Med.* 955, where I suggest that F. W. Schmidt's ἐκγόνοις ἐμός (corrupted first to ἐμοῖς and then, since the sense was clearly defective, 'corrected' to the Homeric οἷς) gives everything we could ask for.

gives any encouragement to this view.[1] Had he written τίνα μ' αὖ τήνδ' ἐς ἄρκυν ἤγαγες, we would have no hesitation in translating 'what is this net into which you have brought me?'[2] The locution is stylish (see *El.* 341, *Or.* 1347, *Cy.* 222) and the corruption is not unthinkable. Just a bit less stylish but more than a bit easier to account for paleographically would be ποῖ μ' αὖ, τίνα δ' ἐς ἄρκυν ἤγαγες; In uncials the alpha could easily have disappeared in TINAΔ, and the resultant τινδ 'corrected' to τήνδ'.

113-4

†ὅρα δέ γ' εἴσω τριγλύφων ὅποι κενὸν
δέμας καθεῖναι†·

113-5 suspectos habet Diggle   113 ὅπου Elmsley, ὅπῃ Kirchhoff χρεὼν Nauck   post h. v. lac. indic. Platnauer

This passage bristles with problems and is deservedly daggered by D. (1) Some have questioned the appropriateness of δέ γ'. The strong adversative does occur within a continuous speech, and Denniston, *GP* 155, notes that it usually has a sense of imaginary dialogue where the speaker counters his own words. That sense is seemingly absent here, and Denniston puts this passage among the few examples, almost all suspicious, of δέ γ' that are weakly adversative or purely continuative. (2) The infinitive καθεῖναι has no construction. Nauck's χρεὼν attempts to meet this. (3) εἴσω τριγλύφων must apparently mean 'between the triglyphs', but there is no evidence that εἴσω can mean 'between' rather than 'inside of'. (4) Elmsley and Kirchhoff thought that ὅποι had the wrong sense and proposed ὅπου and ὅπῃ respectively.

D. Sansone, *Mnemosyne* 29 (1976), 79 deals with (2) and (3) by proposing εἰ σῷ (=σῷοι) and καθεῖμεν (aorist optative). But as J. K. Newman, *RhM* 126 (1983), 118, points out, καθεῖμεν would be doubtful as the kind of optative illustrated by *HF* 302-3 ἤδη δ' ἐσῆλ-

[1] In the supplement, s.v. III, the word is translated 'to what end or result? in what (final, eventual) circumstances?' In none of the examples is 'for what purpose?' a plausible translation.

[2] Cropp translates 'O Phoebus, what is this net you have led me into now . . . ?', which sounds like a translation of τίνα μ' αὖ τήνδ' ἐς ἄρκυν ἤγαγες.

θέ μ' εἰ παραιτησαίμεθα / φυγὰς τέκνων τῶνδ', cited by Sansone to show the use of the optative 'regular in this construction'. From the examples cited in Goodwin, *MT* § 489 it would be prudent to conclude that in post-Homeric Greek the optative is normally used in such 'if haply' clauses only when the main verb is past, though at Ar. *Av*. 120 it depends on a perfect. Wilamowitz ad *HF* 302 takes εἰ + optative as the secondary form of ἐάν + subjunctive (Bond takes a different view of the construction). In the end therefore Sansone's conjecture gives doubtful Greek at the cost of non-trivial alteration.

Newman is inclined to keep the text but alter the punctuation. He feels that δέ γ' is all right, being an answer to Orestes' suggestions and questions at 94ff. (But in Denniston's examples δέ γ' replies to the speaker's own words.) He says that 113-4, repunctuated with a comma after τριγλύφων, can mean 'Look within the triglyphs, to where there is a gap for us to let ourselves down.' But if 'within' means 'inside of', as it should, it is not 'inside of the triglyphs' that one looks if trying to find a way through roof or wall to the inside. Newman ends by suggesting that Platnauer's idea of a lacuna after 113 may be right after all. He proposes, e.g.,

> ὅρα δέ γ' εἴσω τριγλύφων, ὅποι κενὸν
> ⟨εὑρόντε χάσμα σὺν θεῷ δυναίμεθ' ἂν⟩
> δέμας καθεῖναι·

Now, at least, ὅποι functions properly, indicating that inside the temple is where they wish to let themselves down once they have found a chink. But the imperative that introduces the whole sentence still lacks plausibility: why look 'beyond the triglyphs'? Indeed why are triglyphs mentioned at all? One would more readily expect 'beyond the walls or doors'. Why, for an expression to denote the inside of the temple, is our attention directed to the frieze?

'Beyond the triglyphs' is a rational expression to use if the point of entry is to be above ground level. And indeed the easiest way to break into a stone building would be to remove some of the roof tiles and let oneself down by a rope. Then indeed one would be 'beyond the triglyphs', the triglyphs being the first things one would pass on one's descent. In order for this to be conveyed to the audience, how-

ever, it will have to be spelled out. I locate the lacuna within the line and replace the dubious δέ γ' with δέ μ', e.g.,

ὅρα δέ μ' εἴσω τριγλύφων ⟨εἰ χρὴ περᾶν
ἀναβάντα κεράμων τ' ἐξελόνθ'⟩ ὅπῃ κενὸν
δέμας καθεῖναι·

'See whether I should pass beyond the triglyphs by climbing up, and having removed some of the roof-tiles, let myself down where there is a hole.'[1]

218-9

νῦν δ' ἀξείνου πόντου ξεῖνα
δυσχόρτους οἴκους ναίω,

It is hard to see why the house Iphigenia lives in should be called 'ill-provided with food or provender'. Nowhere else in the play is it implied that the land of the Taurians is poorer in grain than Greece.[2] A simple correction of δυσχόρτους to συγχόρτους, proposed by Köchly, eliminates the reference to poverty and provides a more plausible use for the genitive ἀξείνου πόντου. For σύγχορτος with the genitive, 'bordering on', cf. *Andr.* 16-7 and *HF* 371. There are apparently no other occurrences of δύσχορτος in Greek literature. I suggest that it is a *vox subtrahenda lexicis,* and that the next edition of LSJ should read 'δυσχόρτους, f.l. at *IT* 219 for συγχόρτους (Köchly)'.

---

[1] Bluma Trell, 'A Numismatic Solution of Two problems in Euripides', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 7th ser., vol 4 (1964), 93-101, suggests that Euripides may have imagined a door in the pediment like the one attested on coins for the temple of Artemis at Ephesus. That is a possibility, but I still cannot believe that the text is sound.

[2] At 134 Europe is described as having pasturelands well provided with trees: cf. Hdt. 7.5.3 where Mardonius, urging Xerxes to invade Europe, says ἡ Εὐρώπη περικαλλὴς χώρη καὶ δένδρεα παντοῖα φέρει τὰ ἥμεργα. But a land might not have many trees and still produce abundant grain.

567-75

Ιφ. ὁ τοῦ θανόντος δ' ἔστι παῖς Ἄργει πατρός;
Ορ. ἔστ', ἄθλιός γε, κοὐδαμοῦ καὶ πανταχοῦ.
Ιφ. ψευδεῖς ὄνειροι, χαίρετ'· οὐδὲν ἦτ' ἄρα.
Ορ. οὐδ' οἱ σοφοί γε δαίμονες κεκλημένοι
πτηνῶν ὀνείρων εἰσὶν ἀψευδέστεροι.
πολὺς ταραγμὸς ἔν τε τοῖς θείοις ἔνι
κἀν τοῖς βροτείοις· †ἓν δὲ λυπεῖται μόνον†,
ὅτ' οὐκ ἄφρων ὢν μάντεων πεισθεὶς λόγοις
ὄλωλεν ὡς ὄλωλε τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν.

570-5 hos vv. suspectos habet Diggle

D. suspects 570-5, but M. J. Cropp, *ICS* 22 (1997), 30-1, narrows the suspicion to 572-5. The problems start at 572 since 570-1 reply to Iphigenia by casting doubt on the veracity not only of dreams but of the gods, a comment that alludes to his being deceived, as he thinks, by Apollo. The asyndeton in 572 has no justification. In 573 ἓν δὲ λυπεῖται μόνον may well be corrupt and hence no indication of spuriousness, though if we adopt Monk's ὃς for ὅτ' in 574, we could translate 'Only one grief has he who though no fool yet trusted the words of seers, etc.'. But when we reach the last pair of lines we come to an expression apparently written for a different play. Euripides is fond of the kind of ambiguous language that allows a speaker to say something with a private meaning opposite to the one his interlocutor is meant to understand (a partial list is given by Jackson *MS* 131). Typical is the use of tautological expressions like *Hec.* 1000, ὦ φιληθεὶς ὡς σὺ νῦν ἐμοὶ φιλῇ: cf. *El.* 1122 and *IA* 649 (used non-deceptively at *Med.* 1011 and *El.* 289).[1] Another source of ambiguity is the appeal to persons alleged to know the truth, e.g. *Ion* 306, ὁ Φοῖβος οἶδε τὴν ἐμὴν ἀπαιδίαν. Both sorts of ambiguity are in play in 574-5, and we should conclude that these lines describe someone in terms designed to make the speaker's interlocutor think he is dead when he is in fact alive. But in our play Orestes is not pretending that Orestes is dead. Nor do the lines fit the case of Iphigenia, to whom

[1] H. W. Johnstone, *Glotta* 58 (1980), 49-62, calls this figure 'pankoinon' and discusses its use both in deception and in dismissing a question.

they are assigned in L. Of her it could be said that she ὄλωλεν ὡς ὄλωλε τοῖσιν εἰδόσιν, for she is dead in the eyes of her family but alive for those who know the truth. But she did not meet her assumed end through misplaced trust in oracles. These four lines must come from a play where someone represents himself as dead in order to fool someone who wants to kill him. For a full discussion of the subject of ambiguous language in tragedy see Judith A. Nelson, 'Ambiguity and Deception in Greek Tragedy', diss. University of Virginia, 1989.

727-40

δέλτου μὲν αἵδε πολύθυροι διαπτυχαί,
ξένοι, πάρεισιν· ἃ δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσδε βούλομαι
ἀκοῦσατ'. οὐδεὶς αὐτὸς ἐν πόνοις ⟨τ'⟩ ἀνὴρ
ὅταν τε πρὸς τὸ θάρσος ἐκ φόβου πέσῃ.
ἐγὼ δὲ ταρβῶ μὴ ἀπονοστήσας χθονὸς
θῆται παρ' οὐδὲν τὰς ἐμὰς ἐπιστολὰς
ὁ τήνδε μέλλων δέλτον εἰς Ἄργος φέρειν.
Ορ. τί δῆτα βούλῃ; τίνος ἀμηχανεῖς πέρι;
Ιφ. ὅρκον δότω μοι τάσδε πορθμεύσειν γραφὰς
πρὸς Ἄργος, οἷσι βούλομαι πέμψαι φίλων.
Ορ. ἦ κἀντιδώσεις τῷδε τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους;
Ιφ. τί χρῆμα δράσειν ἢ τί μὴ δράσειν; λέγε.
Ορ. ἐκ γῆς ἀφήσειν μὴ θανόντα βαρβάρου.
Ιφ. δίκαιον εἶπας· πῶς γὰρ ἀγγείλειεν ἄν;

Commentators surprisingly fail to note that the second half of 734 makes no sense. Iphigenia has said plainly what she is perplexed about: the bearer of the letter, having been let go, might break his promise to deliver it. She has indicated in ἃ δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσδε βούλομαι ἀκοῦσατ' that she is about to make a proposal. The first half of 734 asks what the proposal is. Orestes' δῆτα shows that he understands Iphigenia's problem and wants to know her solution. He cannot therefore say 'About what are you perplexed?'[1] If meter allowed, expected sense would be given by τί δῆτα βούλῃ ὧν ἀμηχανεῖς πέρι;

[1] The first draft of my Loeb shared in the general fault and translated 'About what are you perplexed?' Margaretta Fulton, who has vetted the English of all my Loeb volumes

We can solve this problem and still save every letter transmitted in L by marking a lacuna. Formally there is nothing wrong with a passage that starts with a single-line speech and then a distich before settling into regular stichomythia. (See *HF* 1110-2 and Denniston on *El.* 650-1.) But there are several instances (*Alc.* 803ff., 1072ff., *Med.* 663ff., *Hip.* 311ff., *Andr.* 577ff. etc.) where regular stichomythia is preceded by a short interchange in distichomythia, and that may be what Euripides wrote here:

Ορ. τί δῆτα βούλῃ; τίνος ⟨ἐπήκοος λόγου
θαρσεῖν ἔχοις ἂν ὢν⟩ ἀμηχανεῖς πέρι;
Ιφ. ὅρκον δότω μοι τάσδε πορθμεύσειν γραφὰς
πρὸς Ἄργος, οἷσι βούλομαι πέμψαι φίλων.

In fact, the distichomythia may go on for one more couplet. It seems to have gone unnoticed that 738 is identical with *Med.* 748. In the *Medea* context the line is necessary, but here it is dispensable:

Ορ. ἦ κἀντιδώσεις τῷδε τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους,
[τί χρῆμα δράσειν ἢ τί μὴ δράσειν; λέγε]
ἐκ γῆς ἀφήσειν μὴ θανόντα βαρβάρου;
Ιφ. δίκαιον εἶπας· πῶς γὰρ ἀγγείλειεν ἄν;

For an example of a question in distichomythia being answered by the first line of a stichomythia see *Andr.* 581-3.

766-81

Πυ. καλῶς ἔλεξας τῶν τε σῶν ἐμοῦ θ' ὕπερ.
σήμαινε δ' ᾧ χρὴ τάσδ' ἐπιστολὰς φέρειν

---

for Harvard Press, wrote 'Isn't there some other way to translate this? It makes no sense', which drew my attention to the problem.

The printed translations are either accurate and absurd ('Quid igitur vis? qua de re angeris?' Glasgow edition of 1821; 'Was willst du denn? Worüber bist du ratlos?' G. Finsler; 'What do you wish then? What do you find difficult?' R. Lattimore; 'What wouldst thou then? Why thus disquieted?' A. S. Way) or sensible but impressionistic ('What would you suggest to ease your mind?' W. Bynner). H. Grégoire ('Que veux-tu donc? Pourquoi t'alarmes-tu ainsi?') contrives to suggest by his 'ainsi' that Orestes' question concerns the degree of Iphiginia's fear, which however fits ill with the first half of the line, asking what she wants to do..

πρὸς Ἄργος ὅ τι τε χρὴ κλυόντα σοῦ λέγειν.
Ιφ. ἄγγελλ' Ὀρέστῃ, παιδὶ τἀγαμέμνονος·
Ἡ 'ν Αὐλίδι σφαγεῖσ' ἐπιστέλλει τάδε
ζῶσ' Ἰφιγένεια, τοῖς ἐκεῖ δ' οὐ ζῶσ' ἔτι·
Ορ. ποῦ δ' ἔστ' ἐκείνη; κατθανοῦσ' ἥκει πάλιν;
Ιφ. ἥδ' ἣν ὁρᾷς σύ· μὴ λόγων ἔκπλησσέ με.
Κόμισαί μ' ἐς Ἄργος, ὦ σύναιμε, πρὶν θανεῖν,
ἐκ βαρβάρου γῆς καὶ μετάστησον θεᾶς
σφαγίων, ἐφ' οἷσι ξενοφόνους τιμὰς ἔχω.
Ορ. Πυλάδη, τί λέξω; ποῦ ποτ' ὄνθ' ηὑρήμεθα;
Ιφ. ἢ σοῖς ἀραία δώμασιν γενήσομαι,
Ὀρέσθ' (ἵν' αὖθις ὄνομα δὶς κλύων μάθῃς),
Ορ. ὦ θεοί. Ιφ. τί τοὺς θεοὺς ἀνακαλεῖς ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς;
Ορ. οὐδέν· πέραινε δ'· ἐξέβην γὰρ ἄλλοσε.

773 λόγων Seidler: -οις L: cf. 240, 912, Or. 549 779 Iphigeniae contin. Tr^2: Pyladae trib. L 780 Ορ. Burges: Πυ. Tr^2: om. L 781 Ορ. Burges: Πυ. L 782 Iphigeniae trib. Markland: Pyladae contin. L

Jackson, *MS* 10-12, proposes relocating 779-81 (in the order 780, 781, 779) after 769. D. does not adopt this or mention it in his apparatus, apparently convinced by the defense of E.-R. Schwinge, *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides* (Heidelberg, 1968), pp. 238-42. I believe the transposition is right, so I take this opportunity to second the argument, especially since Jackson, who usually explains clearly the advantages of his emendations, is here unusually laconic.

Jackson restricts himself to remarking that if we give the only possible answers to two questions we arrive at the solution he proposes: (1) 'When, by every law of human nature, should Pylades, whether on the Atheian stage or in the Tauric Chersonese, have exclaimed, "O God"?' (2) 'When should Iphigenia have repeated the name "Orestes"?' Schwinge is unimpressed by (1) and says that it is more natural for Pylades to exclaim 'O God' when he has learned not only the addressee's name but also the sender's. Pylades and Orestes, he says, are already aware that the woman is an Argive, hence her sending a letter to Orestes is by itself not astonishing. To this Jackson could have replied that the revelation that the letter is meant for

Orestes means a great deal in view of 583, 590, 639-42, 736, 744, and 761, in all of which it is emphasized that the unnamed recipient of the letter is a kinsman of Iphigenia. The effect of 'Tell Orestes, son of Agamemnon' is that of a bombshell. An ancient dramatist would do well to underline the astonishing effect of these words on the young men by allowing one of them to exclaim here. Another point not touched on by Jackson is that Pylades answers Iphigenia's question about his outburst with 'It was nothing; go on: my mind was elsewhere'. The command πέραινε makes perfect sense where Jackson puts it: the only part of the message yet given was the addressee's name, and Pylades can say 'Go on'. In its transmitted order it comes after 779, i.e. after Iphigenia has given the entire message she means to quote. Pylades would have no reason to think that there is anything more to be said.

Jackson's second question about the place of the vocative cannot be so confidently answered: other tragic messages such as *Hec.* 891-4 have vocatives neither at the beginning nor at the end. And one could contemplate moving 780-1 to follow 769 but leaving 779 where it is. But the vocative at the beginning strikes me as crisp and the vocative at the end as flaccid: since letters frequently start with both sender's and addressee's names, 'Ορέστα seems in place at the very start.

782-7

τάχ' οὖν ἐρωτῶν σ' εἰς ἄπιστ' ἀφίξεται·
λέγ' οὕνεκ' ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου θεὰ
Ἄρτεμις ἔσωσέ μ', ἣν ἔθυσ' ἐμὸς πατήρ,
δοκῶν ἐς ἡμᾶς ὀξὺ φάσγανον βαλεῖν,
ἐς τήνδε δ' ᾤκισ' αἶαν. αἵδ' ἐπιστολαί,
τάδ' ἐστὶ τἀν δέλτοισιν ἐγγεγραμμένα.

We should consider deleting 785. There is in itself nothing wrong with using βάλλω and similar verbs of a sword (see Willink on *Or.* 51, 1132-3, and 1302-4) but the line interrupts the close connection between Artemis' saving of Iphigenia and her settling her in the land of the Taurians. Iphigenia here gives a reprise of what she said in the prologue.

ἐλθοῦσα δ' Αὐλίδ' ἡ τάλαιν' ὑπὲρ πυρᾶς
μεταρσία ληφθεῖσ' ἐκαινόμην ξίφει.
ἀλλ' ἐξέκλεψεν ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου
Ἄρτεμις Ἀχαιοῖς, διὰ δὲ λαμπρὸν αἰθέρα
πέμψασά μ' ἐς τήνδ' ᾤκισεν Ταύρων χθόνα, κτλ.

There she passes quickly from rescue to resettlement, and it seems proper for her to do so here, rather than dilate upon Agamemnon's state of mind. Line 785 makes it harder to grasp that the subject of ᾤκισ' in 786 is Artemis.

I suggest further that for ἔθυσ' in 784 we read the imperfect ἔθυ'. Agamemnon was in the act of sacrificing his daughter when Artemis rescued her. This corresponds much better with the imperfect than the aorist. (Cf. ἐκαινόμην in 27, quoted above.) The scribe may have been unconsciously influenced by the aorist ἔσωσε to write ἔθυσ'. Alternatively, if the imperfect were written in *scriptio plena* the epsilon could have been misread as a sigma.

909-11

Ορ. καλῶς ἔλεξας· τῇ τύχῃ δ' οἶμαι μέλειν
τοῦδε ξὺν ἡμῖν· ἢν δέ τις πρόθυμος ᾖ,
σθένειν τὸ θεῖον μᾶλλον εἰκότως ἔχει.

Orestes says that Iphigenia's plan of escape has a good chance of success because heaven is involved. Their own efforts, however, will be crucial: 'If someone shows eagerness, it is likely that the gods will be more powerful'. This is not quite right. What happens when people exert themselves is that the gods also exert themselves. Cf. A. *Pers*. 742, ἀλλ' ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις αὐτός, χὠ θεὸς συνάπτεται, and fr. 395 Radt, φιλεῖ δὲ τῷ κάμνοντι συσσπεύδειν θεός. What we need as the first word of 911 is Rauchenstein's σπεύδειν.

1442-96: see *EMC/CV* 44 (2000), 10-23.

ION[1]

1-3

Ἄτλας ὁ νώτοις χαλκέοισιν οὐρανὸν
θεῶν παλαιὸν οἶκον ἐκτρίβων θεῶν
μιᾶς ἔφυσε Μαῖαν, κτλ.

The text given above is that of L modified by Elmsley's simple transposition: L's χαλκέοισι νώτοις violates Porson's law. D. adopts a much more radical transposition, reconstructed by Page from a quotation in Philodemus' *De pietate*, but W. Luppe, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 13 (1983), 45-52, points out that on the *disegno* of the papyrus there is a letter inconsistent with Page's reconstruction: see also his later discussion in *ZPE* 120 (1998), 17-18 and J. Irvine in *ZPE* 117 (1997), 1-7.

In line 2 the occurrence of θεῶν at both beginning and end is suspicious, and Shilleto proposed θεοῦ / ἁλίας and Irvine μιᾶς / Νυμφῶν. But these lack probability.[2] There is a further anomaly.[3] Euripides uses a genitive of source (no preposition) with the intransitive tenses of φύω, e.g. *Hcld.* 509, πατρὸς δ' ἐκείνου φύντας οὗ πεφύκαμεν and *El.* 206, 673, *IT* 4, *Ion* 50, and *Or.* 483. But in the transitive tenses, except in the present passage, he does not. There are, besides this line, 35 instances of φύω and ἐκφύω in the present, future, or first aorist, none with a prepositionless genitive. The same story is told by the *Lexicon Sophocleum* and the *Index Aeschyleus*.

---

[1] I am grateful to John Gibert for criticisms of an earlier draft of this chapter. I refer by author's name to K. H. Lee, *Euripides: Ion* (Warminster, 1997).

[2] Additionally, Wilamowitz in his comment on *HF* 280 drew attention to the fact that sense pause before the last 'foot' of a trimeter is rare in Euripides, and this point was established in detail by Denniston, *CQ* 30 (1936), 74, who notes that in 18,300 trimeters Euripides has only one instance of strong punctuation after the tenth element (*HF* 975), three of moderate, and 28 of light punctuation. Fashions in punctuation vary from age to age and from nation to nation: Wecklein, Murray, and Biehl put a comma after ἐκτρίβων, D. does not. But it is clear that, however we punctuate, with the present text there is a boundary between participial phrase and main clause just before the final iamb, which is then enjambed with the next line. My instinct tells me that this is rare in Euripides, and investigation reveals no other instance in *Ion*.

[3] See J. Ebert, *WüJbb* 9 (1983), 49 and n. 6.

These two problems together suggest substantial corruption. The assumption of a lacuna before θεῶν would solve them both. There is a further difficulty about the sense that points in the same direction. Atlas' whole existence, according to 1-2, consists in 'wearing out the heavens, the gods' ancient abode, with his back'. This does not suggest much opportunity to father children, and it would be as well for the poet to allude to the one occasion when he was relieved of a burden so prejudicial to fatherhood, the time when he went to fetch the apples of the Hesperides while Heracles held up the sky. Perhaps therefore Euripides wrote something like this:

> Ἄτλας ὁ νώτοις χαλκέοισιν οὐρανόν,
> θεῶν παλαιὸν οἶκον, ἐκτρίβων ⟨τὰ νῦν
> ἐκ Πληόνης κρήναισι παρὰ καλαῖς⟩ θεῶν
> μ⟨ε⟩ί⟨ν⟩ας ἔφυσε Μαῖαν, κτλ.

Pleione is named as the mother of Maia at Apoll. 3.10.1. If we supplied ⟨τὰ νῦν / ἐξ Ἑσπερίδος ἀγροῖσι τηλουροῖς⟩ the allusion to the garden of the Hesperides might be even clear. Hesperis is named as Maia's mother at Diod. Sic. 4.27. On this hypothesis the scribe's eye leapt from one word ending in circumflexed vowel plus nu to another, causing the omission.

47-51: see *TAPA* 109 (1979), 111-2.

65-71

> ὧν οὕνεκα
> ἥκουσι πρὸς μαντεῖ' Ἀπόλλωνος τάδε
> ἔρωτι παίδων. Λοξίας δὲ τὴν τύχην
> ἐς τοῦτ' ἐλαύνει, κοὐ λέληθεν, ὡς δοκεῖ.
> δώσει γὰρ εἰσελθόντι μαντεῖον τόδε
> Ξούθῳ τὸν αὑτοῦ παῖδα, καὶ πεφυκέναι
> κείνου σφε φήσει, κτλ.

W. Kraus, *WS* 102 (1989), 35-6, argues forcibly for Schoemann's κοὐ λέληθέ μ', ὡς δοκεῖ, which gives 'and he has not escaped my notice, as he imagines'. I cite this conjecture in my apparatus but do

not adopt it. The implication—that Hermes is trying to investigate what Apollo is trying to conceal from him—seems an odd bit of drama to find in a prologue, and it seems rather forced to see in Apollo's τὰ δ' ἄλλα . . . ἡμῖν μελήσει (35-6) an invitation to Hermes to cease inquiring. On balance the reading of L seems more likely to be right: 'and contrary to appearances [events] have not escaped his notice'. (I now prefer this translation to my original 'he has not forgotten'.)

There is a theoretical ambiguity about expressions like 'as it seems' or 'as he thinks' when the main clause contains a negative: in 'he is not guilty, as you maintain', 'as you maintain' could mean either 'as you maintain he is' or 'as you maintain he is not'. For a Euripidean parallel to the first see *Andr*. 874-5: πατὴρ δέ σ' οὐχ ὧδ' ὡς σὺ δειμαίνεις, τέκνον, προδοὺς ἐάσει δωμάτων τῶνδ' ἐκπεσεῖν; for a parallel to the second see *Ba*. 333-4: κεἰ μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος, ὡς σὺ φῄς, παρὰ σοὶ λεγέσθω.

219-23

Χο. σέ τοι, τὸν παρὰ ναὸν αὐ-
δῶ· θέμις γυάλων ὑπερ-
βῆναι λευκῷ ποδί γ' ⟨οὐδόν⟩;
Ιων οὐ θέμις, ὦ ξέναι.
Χο. †οὐδ' ἂν ἐκ σέθεν ἂν πυθοίμαν αὐδάν;†
Ιων τίνα τήνδε θέλεις;

221 ⟨οὐδόν⟩ Lindau, quod fort. in οὐδ' ἂν 222 abiit voc. γ' deleto ⟨θριγκόν⟩ Hense, ⟨θριγκούς⟩ Wecklein cl. 1321 222 ἐκ σέθεν ἂν πυθοίμεθ' αὐδάν; L. Dindorf (del. οὐδ' ἂν) et Paley, οὐδ' ἂν ἐκ σέθεν ἂν πυθοίμαν; (tum Ιων αὔδα τί θέλεις) Hermann 223 τήνδε Musgrave: δὲ L

The second antistrophe of the parodos, whose opening lines are given above, is unique in tragedy in that nothing in the strophe corresponds to the anapestic interventions of Ion. But the choral portions are in responsion. The strophe tells us to expect for the Chorus's 219-21 two glyconics followed by hag¨. Lindau's ⟨οὐδόν⟩ gives meter and sense in 221. For the next choral line we are in doubt since in the strophe L has ὧδε δερκόμεσθ', ὦ φίλαι in responsion with οὐδ' ἂν

ἐκ σέθεν ἂν πυθοίμαν αὐδάν. Although neither transmitted line gives plausible meter, it would appear that the antistrophe needs trimming, and we might guess that οὐδ' ἂν and αὐδάν were not both meant to stand in the same line. Let us suppose that αὐδάν was intended as a correction for οὐδ' ἄν, entered in the margin but not recognized as a correction. (The mistake may well have been caused by the previous line if Lindau's supplement is correct.) αὐδὰν ⟨δ'⟩ ἐκ σέθεν ἂν πυθοίμαν; gives sense ('Would you tell me something?') and plausible meter (hipponacteum). We could then adopt Wecklein's ὧδε δερκόμεθ', ὦ γυναῖκες in 208.

258-61: see*AJP* 105 (1984), 240.

287-8

Ιων τί δέ; στυγεῖς σὺ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ φίλτατα;
Κρ. οὐδέν· ξύνοιδ' ἄντροισιν αἰσχύνην τινά.

The parallels at 256, *Med.* 925, and *IT* 781 suggest that as a one-word answer οὐδέν can mean 'for no reason' and is the answer to a τί question. It can also mean 'not at all': see *Ion* 404. But that is less satisfactory sense since there is no reason for Creusa to make such a strong denial. To punctuate 287 twice with D. is therefore less plausible than a single question mark. If D.'s punctuation has ms. authority, no editor I have seen explicitly mentions it, and only Hermann of previous editors puts a question mark after τί δέ. Translate 'Ion: Why do you hate what the god loves best? Creusa: No [good] reason: I know a disgraceful deed done in that cave'.

369-80: see *TAPA* 109 (1979), 113-24.

390: see *AJP* 105 (1984), 240.

506-9: see *TAPA* 109 (1979), 115-6.

585-647: see *TAPA* 109 (1979), 116-24 and *AJP* 105 (1984), 240.

825-9

κᾆθ' ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐψεύσαθ', ὅδε δ' ἐψεύσατο
πάλαι τρέφων τὸν παῖδα, κἄπλεκεν πλοκὰς
τοιάσδ'· ἁλοὺς μὲν ἀνέφερ' ἐς τὸν δαίμονα,
†ἐλθὼν δὲ καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἀμύνεσθαι θέλων†
τυραννίδ' αὐτῷ περιβαλεῖν ἔμελλε γῆς.

828 λαθὼν Musgrave   λαβὼν (vel εὑρὼν) δὲ καιρόν, φθόνον Jacobs

D. cites Jacobs' conjecture, which suggests that he feels some doubt about χρόνον ἀμύνεσθαι θέλων. I will argue that the key to emending the passage is to realize that the phrase describes perfectly a motive the Old Man could ascribe to Xuthus. For if Xuthus wants to put Ion on the throne as his successor, he must beware of Time, particularly its propensity to reveal hidden truth. Cf. 575, χρόνῳ δὲ δόντες ταῦτ' (i.e. the identity of Ion's mother) ἴσως εὕροιμεν ἄν, *Hi.* 1051 and 1322. Xuthus must defend himself against Time if he is to succeed in his plan, for, on the Old Man's view, he has acted in a very underhanded way, deliberately siring a child with another woman when Creusa failed to conceive and then falsifying an oracle to give the color of propriety and divine sanction to his scheme. If the fact that Ion is his son comes to light, the pretended oracle is a second line of defense, but his first plan is to keep his actual relation to Ion hidden and find some excuse to confer the kingship on someone he presents to the public as his adopted son. Once he has done so, the *fait accompli* of Ion's position as king will neutralize any later revelation.

The last three words of the line, therefore, seem to be correctly transmitted. For the beginning, we could write, with Musgrave, λαθὼν δὲ καὶ τὸν, changing only the first word. This gives a clear contrast with ἁλοὺς μὲν: 'But if he remained undetected, in an attempt to ward off [the revelations of] Time, he meant to invest him with the kingship'. But the καί, which I had to leave untranslated, is awkward, and the line lacks a proper caesura. Furthermore, the act of investing someone who is supposedly merely the ξένος of the king with the kingship is not likely to be a simple one, and we would wel-

come some notice of the difficulties involved. Xuthus himself describes such machinations as follows (659-60):

> χρόνῳ δὲ καιρὸν λαμβάνων προσάξομαι
> δάμαρτ' ἐᾶν σε σκῆπτρα τἄμ' ἔχειν χθονός.

I suggest that the first part of Jacobs' conjecture, λαβὼν δὲ καιρόν, meets expectations perfectly: 'If he was detected, he meant to put the responsibility upon the god [by citing the fictitious oracle], but if he found an occasion, he intended to defend himself against Time and invest him with the kingship.' The juxtaposition of καιρόν with χρόνον, each the object of its own verb, would be a deliberate effect, enhanced additionally by chiasmus. Note that personified Time can be either arthrous or anarthrous: cf. 575, *Hi.* 1051 and 1322 with *HF* 506, 805, and *Pho.* 398.

1024-9

> Πρ. σὺ παῖδα δόξεις διολέσαι, κεἰ μὴ κτενεῖς.
> Κρ. ὀρθῶς· φθονεῖν γάρ φασι μητρυιὰς τέκνοις.
> Πρ. αὐτοῦ νυν αὐτὸν κτεῖν', ἵν' ἀρνήσῃ φόνους.
> Κρ. προλάζυμαι γοῦν τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς ἡδονῆς.
> Πρ. καὶ σόν γε λήσεις πόσιν ἅ σε σπεύδει λαθεῖν.
> Κρ. οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δρᾶσον· χειρὸς ἐξ ἐμῆς λαβὼν κτλ.

1028 λαθεῖν Stephanus: λαβ- L

The sense of 1028, as emended by Stephanus, is not quite right. We must translate 'You will conceal from your husband what he is attempting to conceal from you'. But Creusa will not be concealing from Xuthus what he wants to conceal from her. He is concealing the identity of Ion, but she is concealing that she *knows* the identity of Ion, and these are not the same thing. Owen says that L's λαβεῖν shows the influence of λαβών in the next line, that the presumed original λαθεῖν was corrupted to λαβεῖν under the influence of λαβών. But it happens frequently that the last word of a line is completely lost because the last word of an adjacent line was copied in its place. Here it is easy to imagine that the last word of 1028 was oblit-

erated by having λαβών copied in its place and that this reading was then further adjusted to fit its new surroundings. To learn what once stood there would be a matter of inspired guesswork.

The sense the passage seems to require is given by a line whose corruption into the reading of L is easy to explain. Suppose the Old Man said

καὶ σόν γε λήσεις γνοῦσ' ὅσα σπεύδει πόσιν.

'Yes, and you will conceal that you know all your husband's designs.' Once πόσιν had been obliterated by having λαβών copied in its place, someone may have entered the correction above the line, but a subsequent scribe, feeling that πόσιν ought to stand nearer to σόν, put it where γνοῦσ' was meant to stand.

1043-7

ἐχθρὸν δ' ἐπ' ἄνδρα στεῖχε δεσποτῶν μέτα
καὶ συμφόνευε καὶ συνεξαίρει δόμων.
τὴν δ' εὐσέβειαν εὐτυχοῦσι μὲν καλὸν
τιμᾶν· ὅταν δὲ πολεμίους δρᾶσαι κακῶς
θέλῃ τις, οὐδεὶς ἐμποδὼν κεῖται νόμος.

As transmitted, these lines seem to make a contrast between people in prosperity (εὐτυχοῦσι) and those who wish to harm their enemies (or better 'the enemy'). This is a nonsensical contrast, since having enemies or desiring to harm them does not mean that one is not prosperous: the prosperous do not have fewer enemies than the unfortunate, and there is no reason why the unfortunate should surpass the prosperous in the desire to do them harm.

Lee *ad loc.* suggests that the Old Man is using the word πολέμιοι loosely to mean ἐχθροί, but perhaps he is using it in the exact sense. In dealing with πολέμιοι law and piety do not stand in the way, for killing the enemy in war is ὅσιον. By contrast, in dealings among citizens law and piety are proper. Read, for εὐτυχοῦσι, ἔν γ' ἔταισι, 'among citizens'. Creusa justifies killing Ion at 1290-3, and Ion killing Creusa at 1331-4, in similar terms.

1261-81

Ιων ὦ ταυρόμορφον ὄμμα Κηφισοῦ πατρός,
οἵαν ἔχιδναν τήνδ' ἔφυσας ἢ πυρὸς
δράκοντ' ἀναβλέποντα φοινίαν φλόγα,
ᾗ τόλμα πᾶσ' ἔνεστιν οὐδ' ἥσσων ἔφυ
Γοργοῦς σταλαγμῶν, οἷς ἔμελλέ με κτενεῖν.
λάζυσθ', ἵν' αὐτῆς τοὺς ἀκηράτους πλόκους
κόμης καταξήνωσι Παρνασοῦ πλάκες,
ὅθεν πετραῖον ἅλμα δισκηθήσεται.
ἐσθλοῦ δ' ἔκυρσα δαίμονος, πρὶν ἐς πόλιν
μολεῖν 'Αθηνῶν χὐπὸ μητρυιὰν πεσεῖν.
ἐν συμμάχοις γὰρ ἀνεμετρησάμην φρένας
τὰς σάς, ὅσον μοι πῆμα δυσμενής τ' ἔφυς·
ἔσω γὰρ ἄν με περιβαλοῦσα δωμάτων
ἄρδην ἂν ἐξέπεμψας εἰς Ἅιδου δόμους.
[ἀλλ' οὔτε βωμὸς οὔτ' 'Απόλλωνος δόμος
σώσει σ'· ὁ δ' οἶκτος ὁ σὸς ἐμοὶ κρείσσων πάρα
καὶ μητρὶ τἠμῇ· καὶ γὰρ εἰ τὸ σῶμά μοι
ἄπεστιν αὐτῆς, τοὔνομ' οὐκ ἄπεστί πω.]
ἴδεσθε τὴν πανοῦργον, ἐκ τέχνης τέχνην
οἵαν ἔπλεξε· βωμὸν ἔπτηξεν θεοῦ
ὡς οὐ δίκην δώσουσα τῶν εἰργασμένων.

1275-8 del. Diggle, eosdem post 1281 trai. Musgrave

The problems of these lines are discussed succinctly by D. J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage* (Berkeley, 1979), pp. 110-2, by D. Bain, *CQ* 29 (1979), 263-7, and by Diggle, *PCPS* 20 (1974), 28-31 (=his *Euripidea* 125-9). Ion comes on with his retinue in hot pursuit of Creusa. He sees her (τήνδ', 1262) and orders his men to seize her so that she can be put to death (1266-8). The process takes far longer than one would expect, for he has leisure to utter six lines about how fortunate he is that the attack happened in Delphi among his friends and another four lines saying, quite surprisingly, that taking refuge at an altar will do her no good. (The latter surprises for two reasons: no one has mentioned flight to an altar in his hear-

ing, and his apparent willingness to ignore the rights of someone actually in contact with an altar is shocking.) Only then (1279) do we get an indication that Creusa has in fact fled to Apollo's altar. In spite of 1275-8, which say such flight is useless, Ion expresses chagrin at her crafty wickedness.

Mastronarde canvasses the possibility that the pursuit is a stylized one in slow motion and that the mention of flight to the altar is occasioned by Creusa's slow movement in that direction. He also considers Musgrave's transposition of 1275-8 to follow 1281 (Creusa's contact with the altar thus precedes Ion's aspersions on such a move), as well as D.'s deletion of 1275-8 and Kirchhoff's transposition of 1266-8 to the very end of Ion's speech, before deciding that the transmitted text may well be sound.

1276-7 are difficult, as D. well points out, but 1276 may well be corrupt. I have daggered ὁ σὸς and intuit the sense 'Any pity in this situation belongs not to you but to me and my mother'. The irony is forced, but for all that it is quite Euripidean. Euripidean too is the contrast between σῶμα and ὄνομα. We should save the lines by adopting Musgrave's transposition, which gives excellent dramatic sense.

This leaves the long gap of ten lines between the giving of the order to seize Creusa (1266-8) and its frustration by her reaching the altar. Kirchhoff moved 1266-8, but he could have chosen a better destination. Put them after 1274 and the passage makes faultless dramatic sense. First he sees Creusa,[1] who has not yet taken refuge at the altar, excoriates her, and congratulates himself on his good luck in escaping her plot on his life:

> ὦ ταυρόμορφον ὄμμα Κηφισοῦ πατρός,
> οἵαν ἔχιδναν τήνδ᾽ ἔφυσας ἢ πυρὸς
> δράκοντ᾽ ἀναβλέποντα φοινίαν φλόγα,
> ᾗ τόλμα πᾶσ᾽ ἔνεστιν οὐδ᾽ ἥσσων ἔφυ
> Γοργοῦς σταλαγμῶν, οἷς ἔμελλέ με κτενεῖν. 1265
> ἐσθλοῦ δ᾽ ἔκυρσα δαίμονος, πρὶν ἐς πόλιν 1269
> μολεῖν ᾽Αθηνῶν χὐπὸ μητρυιὰν πεσεῖν. 1270
> ἐν συμμάχοις γὰρ ἀνεμετρησάμην φρένας

---

[1] I agree with Bain that τήνδ᾽ in 1262 implies that Ion has caught sight of her.

τὰς σάς, ὅσον μοι πῆμα δυσμενής τ' ἔφυς·
ἔσω γὰρ ἄν με περιβαλοῦσα δωμάτων
ἄρδην ἂν ἐξέπεμψας εἰς Ἅιδου δόμους. 1274

Then comes the order to seize her. This order is consistent with piety since Creusa is not yet a suppliant, but his command causes her to flee to the altar. Ion realizes that he has been forestalled. His final lines need not be regarded as exhibiting an impiety impossible for this young man: cf. his later protest at 1312-9, likewise not backed by action, against the practice of regarding suppliants at an altar as inviolate. Indeed, it is not even certain that Ion is threatening to drag Creusa away: there are many means consistent with respecting sanctuary to get a suppliant to leave an altar willingly. But they lead well into Creusa's next lines.

λάζυσθ', ἵν' αὐτῆς τοὺς ἀκηράτους πλόκους 1266
κόμης καταξήνωσι Παρνασοῦ πλάκες, 1267
ὅθεν πετραῖον ἅλμα δισκηθήσεται. 1268
ἴδεσθε τὴν πανοῦργον, ἐκ τέχνης τέχνην 1279
οἵαν ἔπλεξε· βωμὸν ἔπτηξεν θεοῦ 1280
ὡς οὐ δίκην δώσουσα τῶν εἰργασμένων. 1281
ἀλλ' οὔτε βωμὸς οὔτ' Ἀπόλλωνος δόμος 1275
σώσει σ'· ὁ δ' οἶκτος †ὁ σὸς† ἐμοὶ κρείσσων πάρα
καὶ μητρὶ τἠμῇ· καὶ γὰρ εἰ τὸ σῶμά μοι
ἄπεστιν αὐτῆς, τοὔνομ' οὐκ ἄπεστί πω.
Κρ. ἀπεννέπω σε μὴ κατακτείνειν ἐμὲ 1282
ὑπέρ τ' ἐμαυτῆς τοῦ θεοῦ θ' ἵν' ἕσταμεν.

These two transpositions allow us to retain all the lines in L without either dubious dramaturgy or making Ion implausibly impious. In view of their general high quality it seems undesirable to delete 1275-8 with Diggle or 1266-8 with Bain. How the dislocations happened is, unfortunately, unclear.

1405: see *AJP* 105 (1984), 241.

1410-1

Ιων παῦσαι πλέκουσα—λήψομαί σ' ἐγώ—πλοκάς.
Κρ. ἐς τοῦθ' ἱκοίμην, τοῦδε τοξεύω, τέκνον.

1410 σ' Tyrwhitt: δ' L πλοκάς Jacobs: καλῶς L

Diggle, *Studies* 115, points out that by itself πλέκω is insufficient to give the sense 'weaving wiles': we expect a cognate accusative. He urges adoption of Jacobs' πλοκάς and punctuating to make λήψομαί σ' ἐγώ parenthetic. But λήψομαί σ' ἐγώ is then parenthetic, and it is undesirable for the thing said in a parenthesis to be the thing taken up by Ion's interlocutor (Creusa wants Ion to λαμβάνειν her, though in a different sense). D.'s basic insight can be saved by adopting a conjecture of Herwerden's: παῦσαι ⟨πλοκὰς⟩ πλέκουσα· λήψομαί σ' ἐγώ [καλῶς]. This allows 'I shall catch you' to stand as an independent sentence and at the end of the line, where it makes Creusa's 'I pray it may be so: that is what I am aiming at, my son' instantly and effortlessly intelligible. The origin of the omission is easy to see. Once it happened, someone was led to supply two syllables to a clearly defective line but to supply them in the wrong place.

HELENA[1]

1-3

Νείλου μὲν αἵδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
ὃς ἀντὶ δίας ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδον
λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος ὑγραίνει γύας.

The verb ὑγραίνει has two objects, πέδον and γύας, unconnected with one another. Several scholars have doubted the soundness of the text, and several likewise have defended it. The purpose of this note is to show that the defenders, though they cause attackers to pause, have nevertheless failed to produce a cogent parallel.

Kannicht calls this the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ κατὰ μέρος and 'pleonastische Parallelismus' and refers to K.-G. I 289 and II 586. But all the parallels cited at I 289 involve persons and the parts of their bodies. That is not the case, of course, with πέδον and γύας, and even if we wanted to be generous and extend this phenomenon to other instances of whole and part, we would have to admit that this is not the relation of the two nouns in question: γύας is not a part of πέδον but a poetic synonym for it. The double expressions at II 586 are either connected with καί, οὐδέ, or ἀλλά (e.g. A. *Cho.* 838, S. *OT* 58) or invite the kind of punctuation suggesting two parallel phrases (e.g. S. *El.* 958, *Tr.* 707). The closest is *Tro.* 1105-6, Ἰλιόθεν ὅς με πολύδακρυν Ἑλλάδι λάτρευμα γᾶθεν ἐξορίζει, not close enough since the one expression is a proper name. Proper names figure in the instances cited by Renehan, *Studies in Greek Texts* 60, instances of geographical apposition such as *Il.* 2.144-5 κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης, / πόντου Ἰκαρίοιο: in all his instances but one (Chaeremon 71 F 17.2), one of the pair of nouns is provided with a proper name. And in every instance except *Il.* 14.283-4, the two expressions stand side by side. Renehan also cites *HF* 943-6 but notes that editors are right to prefer Scaliger's πάλιν. I agree.

---

[1] In this chapter I refer by author's name to A. M. Dale, *Euripides: Helen* (Oxford, 1967) and R. Kannicht, *Euripides: Helena*, 2 vols. (Heidelberg, 1969).

At *Thesmo.* 855-7 Aristophanes quotes *Hel.* 1-3 as follows:

Νείλου μὲν αἵδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
ὃς ἀντὶ δίας ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδον
λευκῆς νοτίζει μελανοσυρμαῖον λεών.

This diverges widely from the text of L. It is unlikely to be what Euripides wrote, yet it shows (apparently) the same construction. But the construction is if anything even less credible here, and one cannot rule out Herwerden's μελανοσυρμαίῳ λεῷ, adopted by Coulon. One further indication that all may not be well with the text of *Thesmo.* (dependent solely on the Ravennas) is that λευκῆς seems odd. It makes perfect sense as an epithet for 'snow' in the Euripidean original but seems pointless as a further epithet for δίας ψακάδος. We have to reckon with the possibility that a line was omitted and that Aristophanes *expanded* the original, e.g.

ὃς ἀντι δίας ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδον
λευκῆς ⟨τακείσης χιόνος ὑγραίνει †γύας†
χοὔτως⟩ νοτίζει μελανοσυρμαῖον λεών.

In short, the defense is not wholly satisfying. The suspicion must exist that where γύας now stands Euripides wrote something like Heiland's δρόσῳ. A further suspicion is that πέδον and γύας were ancient variants in line 2, that γύας (the rarer word) was the original, and that an attempt to correct πέδον by writing γύας next to it somehow resulted in the expulsion of δρόσῳ. The version of line 2 with the banalized πέδον then must have influenced the text of Aristophanes. I print the following:

Νείλου μὲν αἵδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
ὃς ἀντὶ δίας ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου γύας
λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος ὑγραίνει δρόσῳ.

16-22

ἡμῖν δὲ γῆ μὲν πατρὶς οὐκ ἀνώνυμος
Σπάρτη, πατὴρ δὲ Τυνδάρεως· ἔστιν δὲ δὴ

λόγος τις ὡς Ζεὺς μητέρ' ἔπτατ' εἰς ἐμὴν
Λήδαν κύκνου μορφώματ' ὄρνιθος λαβών,
ὃς δόλιον εὐνὴν ἐξέπραξ' ὑπ' αἰετοῦ
δίωγμα φεύγων, εἰ σαφὴς οὗτος λόγος·
Ἑλένη δ' ἐκλήθην.

It is clear that the sentence beginning ἔστιν δὲ δὴ λόγος τις in 17 is a parenthesis interrupting the progress from country and father (16-17) to name (22). To my taste it is now a bit too long. What is worse, it contains elements that are irrelevant, clumsy, and nonsensical. These are all in 20-1, and I propose to delete those lines. Here is the evidence. a) δόλιον εὐνὴν ἐξέπραξ' looks as if it is trying to mean 'contrived a secret tryst or affair', but then the following participial phrase is confusing and awkward: you cannot have a tryst while in flight from an eagle. Also the adjective is wrong. 'Secret' would be conveyed by κρύφιον, while a δόλιος εὐνή would be sex with some harm in view. Zeus of course does intend harm—to the human race—but that is not relevant here. Alternatively, it could mean that the swan gained entrance to Leda's chamber because it was being pursued by an eagle. This means that the adjective and the participial phrase are now correct, but then εὐνὴν ἐξέπραξ' is a bit too vigorous sounding. On balance the latter is probably what the author meant to say. But we may ask b) why does this detail belong in such a cursory, glancing, and parenthetical account? c) In εἰ σαφὴς οὗτος λόγος the reference of the demonstrative is fatally unclear: does the author mean the whole metamorphosis of Zeus, or only the part about being chased by an eagle? Further, the whole parenthesis had opened with 'There is a story that Zeus flew to my mother in the form of a swan'. This does not assert anything beyond that there is a story. The words εἰ σαφὴς οὗτος λόγος would make sense only if Helen had asserted that something was the case: 'if this story is true'. d) Lastly, though Helen presents the swan-metamorphosis as an account, she is elsewhere not skeptical about being Zeus's daughter: see 45-6, where Zeus's care for Helen is unexplained unless she is Zeus's daughter. Others too simply assume the truth of this parentage: 77, 81, 214-5, 470, 489-91, 637, 1527. To show the gain of excision, I transcribe:

ἡμῖν δὲ γῆ μὲν πατρὶς οὐκ ἀνώνυμος

Σπάρτη, πατὴρ δὲ Τυνδάρεως--ἔστιν δὲ δὴ
λόγος τις ὡς Ζεὺς μητέρ' ἔπτατ' εἰς ἐμὴν
Λήδαν κύκνου μορφώματ' ὄρνιθος λαβών--
Ἑλένη δ' ἐκλήθην.

36-7

τὰ δ' αὖ Διὸς
βουλεύματ' ἄλλα τοῖσδε συμβαίνει κακοῖς·

L gives a sentence we must translate, with Dale, 'Again the plans of Zeus in their turn (ἄλλα= 'besides', 'separately') work in with these afflictions'. But since τὰ Διὸς βουλεύματα has an article, we might suppose that ἄλλα goes with something else. Its proximity to τοῖσδε suggests 'other in addition to these'. Orelli suggested συμβάλλει for συμβαίνει, which gives perfect sense provided we undo the false assimilation of ending by writing κακά for κακοῖς: 'But again the plans of Zeus added other woes to these: for he brought a war upon Greece, etc.'

80

Τε. ἥμαρτον· ὀργῇ δ' εἶξα μᾶλλον ἤ μ' ἐχρῆν·

Since the second part of 80 makes the first explicit, it would seem that δ' is not wanted. We should omit the punctuation and write τ'.

131-2

Ελ. κἀκ τοῦδε Μενέλεων οὔτις οἶδ' ἀφιγμένον;
Τε. οὐδείς· θανὼν δὲ κλῄζεται καθ' Ἑλλάδα.

131 Μενέλεων Scaliger: -λαον L οἶδ' Aldina: εἶδ' L

The οὔτις of 131 is answered, without any metrical constraint, by οὐδείς in 132, a pointless variation in a place where repetition is normal. But rather than write οὔτις in 132 and try to convince ourselves that this is a possible scribal error, we might do well to reflect

on a further oddity in 131: Euripides uses the form Μενέλεως (-εων, -εω, -εῳ) some 73 times, but apart from this passage he allows synizesis of the last two syllables only as the initial anapest of a trimeter: see *IT* 357 and *Or.* 18. Instead of Scaliger's Μενέλεων οὔτις we should probably adopt Hermann's Μενέλαόν τις. For a question with indefinite τις answered by οὐδείς, see *IT* 563-4.

It is possible, though, that corruption is deeper, since 131, 'After that does anyone know that Menelaus has arrived?', is surprising sense The absolute ἀφικνεῖσθαι in a context where destination cannot be easily supplied provokes suspicion. We might expect Helen to ask whether anyone knows of Menelaus' arrival *at any place*, the Greek for which is ἐκ τοῦδε Μενέλεών ποί τις οἶδ' ἀφιγμένον; or, avoiding a synizesis avoided by Euripides, ἐκ τοῦδ' Ἀτρείδην ποί τις οἶδ' ἀφιγμένον;

226-8

ὁ δὲ σὸς ἐν ἁλὶ κύμασί τε λέ-
λοιπε βίοτον οὐδέ ποτ' ἔτι
πάτρια μέλαθρα καὶ τὰν
Χαλκίοικον ὀλβιεῖ.

I suggested ὀλβιεῖ in 228 to D. It turned out to be a conjecture by Bothe. It seems worthwhile to devote a few words of explanation to a conjecture that is clearly right but found no favor for nearly two hundred years.

The enumeration of Helen's woes proceeds in clear fashion, the order of presentation perhaps different from the way Helen herself would have arranged it, but quite intelligible: death of her mother Leda, misfortune of her brothers Castor and Pollux, exile from her native land, false reputation for unchastity among the Greeks, death of her husband Menelaus. Each of these topics after the first is introduced by δέ or τε, marking a clear break. By contrast οὐδέ has a more continuative feel to it, and the change of subject is surprising. Further, Helen's absence from home has already been treated in 222, and a return to the same topic is unwelcome. Last, to make assurance more sure, consider πάτρια μέλαθρα. 'He will never gladden his father's halls' makes instant and perfect sense: the royal palace in

Sparta was his father's before him, and it is pathetic that he will never return to the place where he so clearly belongs. By contrast 'You (Helen) will never gladden your father's halls' conjures up the picture of Helen returning to the house of Tyndareus. That might have been her lot as a widow, of course, but there is much less pathos in that—her return there would have been in sad circumstances anyway—than in the simple and direct picture of Menelaus destined never to return to his ancestral home. Athena Chalkioikos is, of course, an important Spartan divinity, worshipped by men and women alike. D. was right to print Bothe's ὀλβιεῖ.

293-305

τί δῆτ' ἔτι ζῶ; τίν' ὑπολείπομαι τύχην;
γάμους ἑλομένη τῶν κακῶν ὑπαλλαγάς,
μετ' ἀνδρὸς οἰκεῖν βαρβάρου πρὸς πλουσίαν
τράπεζαν ἵζουσ'; ἀλλ' ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς
ξυνῇ γυναικί, καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἐστιν πικρόν.
[θανεῖν κράτιστον· πῶς θάνοιμ' ἂν οὖν καλῶς;
ἀσχήμονες μὲν ἀγχόναι μετάρσιοι,
κἀν τοῖσι δούλοις δυσπρεπὲς νομίζεται·
σφαγαὶ δ' ἔχουσιν εὐγενές τι καὶ καλόν,
σμικρὸν δ' ὁ καιρὸς †ἄρτ'† ἀπαλλάξαι βίου.]
ἐς γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἤλθομεν βάθος κακῶν·
αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλαι διὰ τὸ κάλλος εὐτυχεῖς
γυναῖκες, ἡμᾶς δ' αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἀπώλεσεν.

298-302 del. Clark (299-302 iam Hartung [1837]) 298 πῶς θάνοιμ' ἂν οὖν Stephanus: προθάνοιμ' ἂν οὐ L

Kannicht notes that Murray was the first of recent editors to have the courage to print καὶ τὸ σῶμ' in 297. He explains σῶμα as the seat of bodily pleasures. G. Müller, *Gnomon* 47 (1975), 233, takes issue, maintaining that σῶμα is the equivalent of κάλλος.

I find Kannicht's suggestion too cryptic and compendious to be plausible. Müller's seems better: a woman's own physical beauty will make her husband pay attention to her, unwelcome attention on the hypothesis here considered. It is therefore possible to translate

'But when a woman is married to a man she dislikes, even her own body becomes distasteful to her'.

There can be no doubt that the discussion of suicide methods is an interpolation. But Hartung's deletion of 299-302 is preferable to the one adopted by D.: 298, with L's οὐ instead of Stephanus' οὖν, is essential if we are to make sense of γάρ in 303. Lines 303-5 are not an explanation of the fact that women find their own bodies distasteful to them if they don't like their husbands. Rather, they explain why her situation is hopeless and why death is preferable. It is possible that οὐ was corrupted to οὖν in some ancient copies and that this provoked the discussion of suicide methods.

308-12

Ελ. καὶ μὴν σαφῶς γ' ἔλεξ' ὀλωλέναι πόσιν.
Χο. πόλλ' ἂν λέγοιτο καὶ διὰ ψευδῶν σαφῆ.
Ελ. καὶ τἄμπαλίν γε τῶνδ' ἀληθείας ἔπι.
Χο. ἐς ξυμφορὰν γὰρ ἀντὶ τἀγαθοῦ φέρῃ.
Ελ. φόβος γὰρ ἐς τὸ δεῖμα περιβαλών μ' ἄγει.

309 λέγοιτο Blaydes: γένοιτο L 309-10 σαφῆ . . . ἔπι Jackson (σαφῆ . . . ἔπη iam Hermann): ἔπη . . . σαφῆ L 312 aut φόβος aut δεῖμα suspectum

Jackson's otherwise excellent restoration of 309-10 (*MS* 41) is open to one objection, namely that 310 as he writes it is irrelevant. To the remark 'Many clear statements are false' it is no relevant reply to say 'Yes, and many unclear statements[1] are true' since unclear statements do not figure in the argument. Jackson could have finished the job by writing Stephanus' τοὔμπαλίν and setting a comma after τῶνδ': 'Yes, and, conversely, many are true'.

320-3

ἐκμαθοῦσα δ' εὖ
πρὸς τὰς τύχας τὸ χάρμα τοὺς γόους τ' ἔχε.

[1] That τἄμπαλιν is felt as a n. pl. substantive, 'things that are the reverse (of clear)' can be inferred from A. *Pers.* 223.

πρὶν δ' οὐδὲν ὀρθῶς εἰδέναι, τί σοι πλέον
λυπουμένῃ γένοιτ' ἄν; ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ.

The sense we require in 322-3 is 'But before you learn what the situation is, what advantage do you get from grieving?' But πρὶν δ' οὐδὲν ὀρθῶς εἰδέναι cannot mean 'before you learn *anything* for sure': the negative is entirely unwelcome. The required sense could have been expressed in a number of ways, but πρὶν οὖν τάδ' ὀρθῶς εἰδέναι is close to what is transmitted. Corruption, however, could well be deeper.

348-50

Ελ. σέ γὰρ ἐκάλεσα, σὲ δὲ κατόμοσα,
τὸν ὑδρόεντι δόνακι χλωρὸν
Εὐρώταν· θανόντος κτλ.

Transmitted γὰρ in 348 makes no sense, for Helen's adjuration of the river Eurotas that she will kill herself if the report of Menelaus' death proves true in no way explains either her own previous words at 340-5 or the Chorus's words of solace in 346-7. Badham's σέ γ' ἀνεκάλεσα involves changing only a single letter, removes the unwanted γὰρ, and restores a compound verb that is frequently used in Euripides for the invocation of deities.

362-7

ἰὼ τάλαινα Τροία,
δι' ἔργ' ἄνεργ' ὄλλυσαι μέλεά τ' ἔτλας.
τὰ δ' ἐμὰ δῶρα Κύπριδος ἔτεκε
πολὺ μὲν αἷμα, πολὺ δὲ δάκρυον
†ἄχεά τ' ἄχεσι δάκρυα δάκρυσιν ἔλαβε πάθεα†,
ματέρες τε παῖδας ὤλεσαν, κτλ.

366 ἄχε' ἐπ' ἄχεσι Paley δάκρυα δάκρυσιν del. Bothe (1826), etiam ἔλαβε πάθεα Hartung (1837) [ἔλαβε] πάθεα ⟨πάθεσι⟩ Wilamowitz (⟨πάθεσι⟩ iam Paley)

G. Müller, *Gnomon* 47 (1975), 234, notes the arbitrariness of the various proposals for dealing with 366 and proposes deleting the verse. The whole apposition is unwelcome after the μέν-δέ antithesis of 365, and the simplest way to account for the impossible ἔλαβε is to suppose that the line was thoughtlessly borrowed from another tragedy where the verb made sense. Similar interpolation has been diagnosed at *Hec.* 62-3, *Su.* 75-6, and *Ba.* 1028. If we delete, however, we must save the meter of 365, now followed by 367, by writing δάκρυ, which we can scan either as a trochee (full trochaic dimeter) or as two shorts (catalectic trochaic dimeter).

397-401

καὶ τοὺς μὲν οὐκέτ' ὄντας ἀριθμῆσαι πάρα,
τοὺς δ' ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀσμένους πεφευγότας,
νεκρῶν φέροντας ὀνόματ' εἰς οἴκους πάλιν.
ἐγὼ δ' ἐπ' οἶδμα πόντιον γλαυκῆς ἁλὸς
τλήμων ἀλῶμαι κτλ.

Menelaus is recounting the miseries of his life. To be sure, he says, the Greek expedition against Troy was the largest armament in history, and it is to his credit that he led so many willing soldiers. We then expect him to comment on the debit side of the ledger. It is here that the argument becomes unclear. 'We can count all of those who perished and those who escaped sea peril and brought home the names of their dead comrades. Whereas I still wander, over the sea.' It may be that there is only one contrast in view, that between the other Greeks, living or dead, whom once can count (Dale translates 'call the roll of'), and Menelaus, who is still wandering at sea. Or it may be that there is a double contrast, first between the dead and those who have come home, and second between both groups and Menelaus.

Kannicht, II 126, argues that ἀριθμῆσαι means 'grasp exactly, as one does a number', and that the two groups are not contrasted with each other but only with Menelaus. He recommends writing τούς τ' in 398. In a posthumously published discussion Walther Kraus, *WS* 113 (2000), 6-7, notes that for the purposes of the distinction between the other Greeks and Menelaus 'number' is an irrelevancy: it

would be absurd to say 'The other Greeks can be counted, but I cannot'. He proposes to take ἀριθμῆσαι as 'put in the category of', which would presumably yield the following (he provides no translation): 'And some of the Greeks one may reckon as dead, while others one may reckon as having escaped sea perils and arrived home safely bearing the names of their dead comrades. But I wander in misery.' This allows us to retain transmitted τοὺς δ', but to me the second predicate seems awfully long, and I worry about the absence of examples of ἀριθμέω with predicate adjective in the classical period (both Kraus's examples are of Roman date).

Kannicht's single contrast could well be right, and perhaps Kraus's point about the irrelevancy of number is a quibble. In the Loeb I print τούς τ' (Rappold) and translate with Dale's 'call the roll of'. But it may be worth recording here another tack, one which takes the idea of 'counting' seriously. It may be that Menelaus does not reckon the raising of the world's greatest army to be a credit in view of the staggering losses he has sustained. (The γὰρ in 393 would not explicate κλεινὸν in 392 but the whole wish that his ancestor had never sired the family.) Perhaps Menelaus' ἀριθμῆσαι emphasizes the huge number of those who perished and the paucity of those who returned. Orelli proposed βαρύ for πάρα. This contributes to Menelaus' theme of misery since every dead comrade you count means that your loss is so much greater. There is a slight inconcinnity, though, as the sentence proceeds, for when you count the living, each one you count decreases the extent of your loss, so counting them could not be βαρύ in the same way. If we accept βαρύ, it becomes attractive to mark a lacuna after 399, as Wecklein suggested, and supply e.g. ⟨σμικρὸν λέγοις ἂν λείψανον στρατεύματος⟩. Transmitted δ' in 398 suggests that we have two separate and distinct statements about the two groups, not the same statement about them both.

Alternatively we might mark a lacuna after ὄντας:

> καὶ τοὺς μὲν οὐκέτ' ὄντας ⟨ἀριθμῆσαι τίς ἄν;
> ὄχλος γὰρ ἀναρίθμητός ἐστ' ὀλωλότων.
> τὸν δ' ἄλλον ὄχλον ῥᾷον⟩ ἀριθμῆσαι πάρα,
> τοὺς ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀσμένους πεφευγότας,
> νεκρῶν φέροντας ὀνόματ' εἰς οἴκους πάλιν.

ἐγὼ δ' ἐπ' οἶδμα πόντιον γλαυκῆς ἁλὸς κτλ.

Once the omission occurred, a scribe would naturally have inserted δ' in 398.

420-2

χρεία δὲ τείρει μ'· οὔτε γὰρ σῖτος πάρα
οὔτ' ἀμφὶ χρῶτ' ἐσθῆτες· αὐτὰ δ' εἰκάσαι
πάρεστι ναὸς ἐκβόλοις ἀμπίσχομαι.

421 αὐτὸ Badham 422 ἀμπίσχομαι Herwerden: ἀμπ- L

D. adopts Herwerden's crasis, though he seems worried about αὐτά. His text could be translated 'One can guess this from the cast-ups from the wreck which I am wearing'. He should have worried about αὐτά, not because of its number but because anaphoric αὐτοῦ etc. is postpositive (see Smyth § 1217) and therefore αὐτὰ cannot here be anaphoric ('them' or 'it'). Reiske's ἔκβολ' οἷς ἀμπίσχομαι avoids this by giving αὐτὰ a noun to go with: 'You can tell from the look of them (εἰκάσαι) that it is merely (αὐτὰ) cast-ups from the wreck that I am wearing. The subject of the understood εἶναι is the unexpressed antecedent of οἷς and the predicate is αὐτὰ ἔκβολα. For ἀμπίσχω with a dative of means see Pl. *Prot.* 320e3.

448

πικρῶς †ἂν οἶμαί γ' ἀγγελεῖν† τοὺς σοὺς λόγους.

πικρῶς ἂν οἶμαι looks genuine. That, of course, implies a present or an aorist infinitive. It is easy enough to adopt Dale's σούς γ' ἐσαγγέλλειν λόγους: the γ' is transmitted. But the line (with this particle) would have more point if the Old Woman said that if she should carry a message indoors, it would bring no pleasure to Menelaus. Read therefore πικρῶς ἂν οἶμαι ⟨σοί⟩ γ' ἐσαγγέλλειν λόγους: 'You will regret it, I think, if I carry *your* message indoors.'

481-2

εὔνους γάρ εἰμ' Ἕλλησιν, οὐχ ὅσον πικροὺς
λόγους ἔδωκα δεσπότην φοβουμένη.

οὐχ ὅσον is difficult, and Burges proposed εἰ καὶ σοὶ, which is a considerable change. Dale translates "'for all the bitterness of my words"; lit. "to an extent not to be measured by . . .'". But the implied proportion is awkward, for in the present situation, to put it mathematically, εὔνοια varies inversely with πικρότης, so that it is a bit odd to say 'I am well-disposed to the Greeks, to an extent greater than the bitterness of my words', which implies that had her words been less bitter her good-will too would have been less. The clumsiness of the couplet raises a question: is the attitude of this anonymous old woman likely to have been something Euripides felt it necessary to limn with perfect exactitude? She never appears again, and if we delete 481-2, what remains fulfills her mission more economically.

489-99

Διός δ' ἔλεξε παῖδά νιν πεφυκέναι.
ἀλλ' ἦ τις ἔστι Ζηνὸς ὄνομ' ἔχων ἀνὴρ
Νείλου παρ' ὄχθας; εἷς γὰρ ὅ γε κατ' οὐρανόν.
Σπάρτη δὲ ποῦ γῆς ἐστι πλὴν ἵνα ῥοαὶ
τοῦ καλλιδόνακός εἰσιν Εὐρώτα μόνον;
διπλοῦν δὲ Τυνδάρειον ὄνομα κλῄζεται,
Λακεδαίμονος δὲ γαῖά τις ξυνώνυμος
Τροίας τ'; ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἔχω τί χρὴ λέγειν.
πολλοὶ γάρ, ὡς εἴξασιν, ἐν πολλῇ χθονὶ
ὀνόματα ταὔτ' ἔχουσι καὶ πόλις πόλει
γυνή γυναικί τ'· οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστέον.

494 διπλοῦν Nauck: ἁπλοῦν L 495 γαῖά τις Nauck: γαῖα τίς L

The chief problem here is that in 489-96 Menelaus appears to be denying, by means of rhetorical questions, that the cause of his puzzlement about the two Helens could be mere synonymy, whereas 497-9 says that synonymy occurs everywhere and hence there is no

cause for wonder. Pearson moved 497-9 to follow 488, and Badham deleted them. Transposition makes an awkward join. In the first part of his speech (483-8) Menelaus expresses shocked surprise (τί φῶ; τί λέξω) that when he is bringing Helen back from Troy he should find another woman of the same name in Egypt. With Pearson's transposition neither the γάρ in 497 nor οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστέον in 499 makes sense: ordinariness cannot be the explanation for shock. By contrast all is well if we delete. The lines will have come from another play.

501-12

ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε βάρβαρος φρένας
ὃς ὄνομ' ἀκούσας τοὐμὸν οὐ δώσει βοράν.
[κλεινὸν τὸ Τροίας πῦρ ἐγώ θ' ὃς ἧψά νιν,
Μενέλαος, οὐκ ἄγνωστος ἐν πάσῃ χθονί.
δόμων ἄνακτα προσμενῶ· διссὰς δέ μοι
ἔχει φυλάξεις· ἢν μὲν ὠμόφρων τις ᾖ,
κρύψας ἐμαυτὸν εἶμι πρὸς ναυάγια·
ἢν δ' ἐνδιδῷ τι μαλθακόν, τὰ πρόσφορα
τῆς νῦν παρούσης συμφορᾶς αἰτήσομαι.]
κακῶν τόδ' ἡμῖν ἔσχατον τοῖς ἀθλίοις,
ἄλλους τυράννους αὐτὸν ὄντα βασιλέα
βίον προσαιτεῖν· ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίως ἔχει.

503-9 del. Willink (504 iam Cobet) 510 τόδ' Lobeck: δέ θ' L: μὲν Paley

With or without Willink's attractive deletion of 503-9, we need a connective in 510, and for that reason neither Paley's κακῶν μὲν nor Lobeck's κακῶν τόδ' is a satisfactory emendation of L's impossible κακῶν δέ θ'. We should adopt Nauck's δ' ἓν. But all is not yet well. Menelaus' complaint is not about a woe that afflicts all the wretched but about one that afflicts himself, namely, that though a king himself he must beg his livelihood from other kings. Yet ἡμῖν . . . τοῖς ἀθλίοις implies that all the wretched are kings who beg their livelihood from other kings. Read τῶν ἀθλίων, a simple case of assimila-

tion of an adjective to the case of the nearest substantive. For ἄθλιος applying to 'disaster' and the like see 483.

550-3

Ελ. ἀδικούμεθ', ὦ γυναῖκες· εἰργόμεσθα γὰρ
τάφου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε, καί μ' ἑλὼν θέλει
δοῦναι τυράννοις ὧν ἐφεύγομεν γάμους.
Με. οὐ κλῶπές ἐσμεν οὐδ' ὑπηρέται κακῶν.

Line 553 is sometimes translated 'I am no robber and no servant of base men' (thus Lattimore and Grégoire). But Way's 'No robber, I, nor minister of wrong' is better: κακῶν is neuter, as at *Hip.* 589 and 1069 and *Andr.* 447.

636-7

οὐκ ἐμέμφθην·
†ἔχω τὰ τοῦ Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε†.

Willink suggests οὐκ ἐμέμφθην / ἐγὼ τᾶς Διὸς λέκτρα Λήδας τε ⟨γήμας⟩, attractive meter (4ba) but unlikely sense: Menelaus, as Helen's reply makes clear, must say that he now has his wife, daughter of Zeus and Leda. Willink makes him say that he makes no complaint that he is *married to* the daughter of Zeus and Leda. Also the emphasis on ἐγώ is hard to explain: no one else *can* complain of being married to Helen, and there is no reason for Menelaus to say that he, for one, is not complaining. Rather, we should punctuate as D. does with a colon at the end of 636: ἔχω explains the reason for his delight. Schaefer reduced the two articles in 637 to one and wrote τῆς. The reduction seems right, and the result suggests we should look for dochmii in the rest of the line (cf. 633-4 2ia ba / 2 δ). The word to query is λέκτρα: we should consider ἔχω τὰν Διὸς Λήδας τ' ⟨ἔκγονον⟩ or τε ⟨σποράν⟩.

652-9

Με. ἔχεις, ἐγώ τε σ᾽· ἡλίους δὲ μυρίους
μόλις διελθὼν ἠ̣σθόμην τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.
Ελ. ἐμὰ δὲ χαρμονα̣ δάκρυα πλέον ἔχει
χάριτος ἢ λύπας.
Με. τί φῶ; τίς ἂν τάδ᾽ ἤλπισεν βροτῶν ποτε;
Ελ. ἀδόκητον ἔχω σε πρὸς στέρνοις.
Με. κἀγὼ σὲ τὴν δοκοῦσαν Ἰδαίαν πόλιν
μολεῖν Ἰλίου τε μελέους πύργους.

654$^{\rm n}$ Ἑλ. Kretschmar: om. L 654 χαρμονα̣ Hermann: -ὰ L: -αν Tr^{3s} (-ᾶν Elmsley) 656$^{\rm n}$ Με. Kretschmar: Ἑλ. L 657$^{\rm n}$ Ἑλ. Kretschmar: om. L

Since Menelaus has lines of lyric verse elsewhere in this scene, there is no reason to deprive him of 654-5, which cohere nicely with what precedes. If we reject Kretschmar's speaker-changes, we get between 648 and 659 a pleasing symmetry of approximately equal paired speeches. Furthermore 656-7 (Helen) closely parallels 658-9 (Menelaus) in that both begin with a trimeter and pass over into lyric.

The words πλέον ἔχει χάριτος ἢ λύπας make a complete utterance and should be kept separate from what precedes. I adopt Reiske's ἐμὰ δὲ χαρμονᾶς δάκρυα (though this is further from the reading of Triclinius than Elmsley's χαρμονᾶν) because the plural seems odd and the singular perfectly apt: 'my tears are those of joy'.

In 653 I write τοῦ for τῆς. We could interpret τὰ τῆς θεοῦ only as 'the role of Hera', but the last mention of Hera's role was before the entrance of Menelaus' servant. In the meantime the pair have been exclaiming repeatedly about the role of providence (642-3), of bad turning to good and of fortune (644-5) and about how unexpected this all is (656-7). Under these circumstances we don't want Menelaus to say 'Having passed with difficulty through countless days I now learn of Hera's role' but rather 'I now perceive heaven's hand'. Further proof that τοῦ is what Euripides wrote in provided by 675, where Menelaus, far from having 'learnt of Hera's role', is completely at a loss what Hera has to do with the story at all until this is carefully explained. Under normal circumstances one would expect the reverse corruption, but it is certainly not beyond the power

of some dull-witted scribe to imagine a reference here to a goddess since Hera in fact was mentioned not so many lines previously. Under normal circumstances we expect ἡ θεός to be corrupted to ὁ θεός. But that does not mean the reverse never happens.

711-9

ὦ θύγατερ, ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἔφυ τι ποικίλον
καὶ δυστέκμαρτον. εὖ δέ πως πάντα στρέφει
[ἐκεῖσε κἀκεῖσ' ἀναφέρων· ὁ μὲν πονεῖ,
ὁ δ' οὐ πονήσας αὖθις ὄλλυται κακῶς,
βέβαιον οὐδὲν τῆς ἀεὶ τύχης ἔχων.
σὺ γὰρ πόσις τε σὸς πόνων μετέσχετε,
σὺ μὲν λόγοισιν, ὁ δὲ δορὸς προθυμίᾳ.
σπεύδων δ' ὅτ' ἔσπευδ' οὐδὲν εἶχε· νῦν δ' ἔχει
αὐτόματα πράξας τἀγάθ' εὐτυχέστατα.]

712 πάντα στρέφει Herwerden: ἀναστρέφει L 713-9 (quorum 713-5 una cum 711-2 cit Stob.) del. Diggle (715 iam suspectum habuit Wecklein); etiam 712 in suspicionem cadit post 713 lac. indic. Holzner

713-9 should be emended, not deleted. Deletion is not that plausible when 712 continues seamlessly into 713, and D.'s 'etiam 712 in suspicionem cadit' seems to recognize this, but the fact that he does not choose to include it in the bracketed lines shows that the suggestion is a bit desperate. The sentiments of the deleted verses are just what we expect here: the Servant comments on how surprisingly events turn out when they are guided by heaven. Expectations are defeated, sharp peripeties occur, and this is illustrated by the fortunes of Helen and Menelaus. The only difficulty of any substance, apart from what Herwerden cured in 712, is that we are not told what happens to the man in 713 who 'has trouble', while we are told that the man who has had no trouble later dies a miserable death. We expect roughly equal treatment of the two cases and expect that the man who, like Menelaus, has had trouble comes at last to happiness, while the second man, a Polycrates figure, after unbroken happiness comes to a sticky end. It is a reasonable conjecture that a line was lost after 713, and that the passage originally ran something like this:

ὦ θύγατερ, ὁ θεὸς ὡς ἔφυ τι ποικίλον
καὶ δυστέκμαρτον. εὖ δέ πως πάντα στρέφει
ἐκεῖσε κἀκεῖσ' ἀναφέρων· ὁ μὲν πονεῖ,
⟨ὄλβου δ' ἔπειτα κευμενῶν θεῶν κυρεῖ,⟩
ὁ δ' οὐ πονήσας αὖθις ὄλλυται κακῶς,
βέβαιον οὐδὲν τῆς ἀεὶ τύχης ἔχων.
σὺ γὰρ πόσις τε σὸς πόνων μετέσχετε,
σὺ μὲν λόγοισιν, ὁ δὲ δορὸς προθυμίᾳ.
σπεύδων δ' ὅτ' ἔσπευδ' οὐδὲν εἶχε· νῦν δ' ἔχει
αὐτόματα πράξας τἀγάθ' εὐτυχέστατα.

Lines 718-9 introduce the related notion that human effort is often unavailing and that blessing not infrequently comes unbidden.

744-60

Θε. ἔσται τάδ', ὦναξ. ἀλλά τοι τὰ μάντεων
ἐσεῖδον ὡς φαῦλ' ἐστὶ καὶ ψευδῶν πλέα.
[οὐδ' ἦν ἄρ' ὑγιὲς οὐδὲν ἐμπύρου φλογὸς
οὐδὲ πτερωτῶν φθέγματ'· εὔηθες δέ τοι
τὸ καὶ δοκεῖν ὄρνιθας ὠφελεῖν βροτούς.]
Κάλχας γὰρ οὐκ εἶπ' οὐδ' ἐσήμηνε στρατῷ
νεφέλης ὑπερθνῄσκοντας εἰσορῶν φίλους
οὐδ' Ἕλενος, ἀλλὰ πόλις ἀνηρπάσθη μάτην.
[εἴποις ἄν, οὕνεχ' ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἠβούλετο.
τί δῆτα μαντευόμεθα; τοῖς θεοῖσι χρὴ
θύοντας αἰτεῖν ἀγαθά, μαντείας δ' ἐᾶν·
βίου γὰρ ἄλλως δέλεαρ ηὑρέθη τόδε,
κοὐδεὶς ἐπλούτησ' ἐμπύροισιν ἀργὸς ὤν·
γνώμη δ' ἀρίστη μάντις ἥ τ' εὐβουλία.]
Χο. ἐς ταὐτὸ κἀμοὶ δόξα μάντεων πέρι
χωρεῖ γέροντι· τοὺς θεοὺς ἔχων τις ἂν
φίλους ἀρίστην μαντικὴν ἔχοι δόμοις.

746-8 del. Wecklein (744-60 iam Hartung [1837]) 752-7 del. Willink

D. deletes 746-8 with Wecklein and 752-7 with Willink. But it is possible that we should delete the whole of 744-60 with Hartung. The lines D. saves are undistinguished: 744-5 are all right in themselves, but in 749 οὐκ εἶπ' οὐδ' ἐσήμηνε στρατῶι is inelegant padding, and 759-60 don't really make sense. Anonymous characters like this servant are normally permitted to be sententious only at the end of a long rhesis (cf. *Hip*. 1249-54, *Andr*. 1161-5), and after they have been given an order, their response is to carry it out without further ado, as at *Hip*. 1265-6.

784-5

Με. ἦ γὰρ γαμεῖν τις τἄμ' ἐβουλήθη λέχη;
Ελ. ὕβριν γ' ὑβρίζων ἐς ἐμέ, κἂν ἔτλην ἐγώ.

785 γ' ὑβρίζων Kirchhoff (γ' iam Boissonade): θ' ὑβρίζειν L εἴς με (praestat ἐς ἐμέ), κἂν Stinton (Coll. Papers 308-9, 443-5): εἴς ἔμ' ἣν L   εἰς ἔμ'· ὦ τλήμων ἐγώ Nauck

Stinton argues that if we accept this line as it stands in L, ὕβριν θ' ὑβρίζειν εἰς ἔμ', ἣν ἔτλην ἐγώ, Helen will be implying that she has been ravished: ὑβρίζειν in a sexual context means rape, and Helen would be saying that this is what she endured. Stinton proposes ὕβριν θ' ὑβρίζειν εἴς με, κἂν ἔτλην ἐγώ. D. corrects εἴς με to ἐς ἐμέ but accepts κἂν ἔτλην ἐγώ and also adopts Kirchhoff's γ' ὑβρίζων.[1] There is one objection, however. Menelaus is later in doubt about whether Helen has avoided Theoclymenus' embraces, and it is hard to see how Helen's past contrary-to-fact could have left him in any doubt. Stinton (p. 309) sees the force of this objection and tries to meet it by claiming there is some ambiguity about ὕβριν γ' ὑβρίζειν εἴς με, κἂν ἔτλην ἐγώ: this, he says, could also mean 'and to take me by force, which I should have endured (if I had resisted)'. But this is desperate: ὕβριν ἂν ἔτλην surely means that the speaker did not suffer violence of any kind, whether resisted or not.

[1] Note that Kirchhoff's conjecture is obligatory: there is no instance in Euripidean stichomythia where someone continues an interlocutor's statement by means of simple τε. (Continuing one's own statement after an interruption is a different matter: see, e.g. *Hi*. 339, *Hec*. 428, *El*. 674, 676, *IT* 816.)

A slight change, one easily explained, allows us to answer Stinton's original objection, avoid the objection to which his proposal was liable, and give point to the emphatic ἐγώ at line end:

Με. ἦ γὰρ γαμεῖν τις τἄμ' ἐβουλήθη λέχη;
Ελ. ὕβριν γ' ὑβρίζων ἐς τὰ σ', ἣν ἔτλην ἐγώ.

Menelaus' words imply that his rights as Helen's husband are under threat, and Helen agrees: in threatening Helen Theoclymenus is in one sense committing violence against Menelaus, whose place he is attempting to usurp, but in another sense the violence is directed against herself. The pointed form of expression is characteristically Euripidean, but at some point a scribe, not understanding the sense in which Theoclymenus ὑβρίζει Menelaus, could have consciously or unconsciously altered 'you' to 'me'. This also meets the objection above: Helen's formulation, outrage against the husband's rights suffered by the wife, holds good whether or not the attempt is successful. Menelaus might well wonder whether Theoclymenus' outrage against him had actually resulted in a sexual encounter with his wife.

797-9

Ελ. ὁρᾷς τάφου τοῦδ' ἀθλίους ἕδρας ἐμάς;
Με. ὁρῶ, ταλαίνα, στιβάδας· ὧν τί σοὶ μέτα;
Ελ. ἐνταῦθα λέκτρων ἱκετεύομεν φυγάς.

797 ταλαίνας P[2]

Since Menelaus, as the second half of his line shows, cannot see any connection between Helen and the pallet she points out to him, the vocative τάλαινα doesn't fully make sense: it would make sense if he knew that was where his wife was forced to sleep, but he does not as yet make this connection. We should adopt the reading of the second hand of P, which gives excellent sense.

884-6

Κύπρις δὲ νόστον σὸν διαφθεῖραι θέλει,
ὡς μὴ 'ξελεγχθῇ μηδὲ πριαμένη φανῇ
τὸ κάλλος Ἑλένης οὕνεκ' ἀνονήτοις γάμοις.

886 ἀνονήτοις Pierson: ὠνητοῖς L

D.'s text can be translated 'Cypris wants to prevent your coming home so that she may not be disgraced when it is known that she has bought the beauty prize with a marriage that, where Helen is concerned, never happened'. But to me the qualifier Ἑλένης οὕνεκ' seems pedantic, as if Theonoe were conceding that in some other connection Cypris had produced actual unions to win the prize of beauty.

We should query not only ὠνητοῖς but also οὕνεκ'. What we would expect is that Ἑλένης is an adnominal genitive depending on γάμοις: 'bought the prize of beauty with the, e.g. nonexistent, marriage of Helen'. This suggests that the first syllable of οὕνεκ' may conceal a negative (cf. *HF* 64 where Canter restored οὕνεκ' ὄλβου for L's οὐκ ἐν ὄλβῳ, the opposite error). We could write οὐκ ἐτητύμοις (Kayser), or οὐκ ὀνησίμοις, or οὐκ ἀνύστοισιν γάμοις.

936-8

κεἰ μὲν θανὼν ὅδ' ἐν πυρᾷ †κατεσφάγη†,
πρόσω σφ' ἀπόντα δακρύοις ἂν ἠγάπων·
νῦν δ' ὄντα καὶ σωθέντ' ἀφαιρεθήσομαι;

936 κατεστάλη Reiske, -φθάρη Schenkl, -στάθη Harry

Renehan, *CP* 93 (1998), 179, attempts to defend θανὼν . . . κατεσφάγη as 'If he had been killed and butchered' and ἐν πυρᾷ as 'at an altar'. It is true that πυρά may designate an altar and that κατασφάττω, 'cut the throat of', is a suitable verb for a sacrifice. But being sacrificed at an altar is not one of the usual dangers a soldier has to face, and the suggestion seems wholly unmotivated. Orestes, of course, nearly met this fate in *Iphigenia Taurica*. So doubtless

there are some who will find attractive the idea that Euripides means, 'If he had been killed as a victim at an altar (as you may have seen threatened in a recent tragedy)'. I am not among them.

The aorist participle could, as Renehan says, be coincident and denote that in which the action of a past verb consists: see Goodwin, *GMT* § 150. But since ἐν πυρᾷ κατεσφάγη seems such an odd thought, we are justified in querying the verb. And if θανὼν describes antecedent action, we should look for a main verb that will describe something that happened to Menelaus on the pyre and after his death. Of the three proposals in D.'s apparatus, the most sensible is Schenkl's: 'If my husband here had been killed and consumed on the pyre'. It is no objection, as G. Müller supposes (*Gnomon* 47 [1975], 239), that then the cremation would already have taken place, 'denn auf den noch nicht verbrannten Leichnam geht ἠγάπων'. Had Menelaus died abroad, Helen would not have heard of it while he was still being laid out for burial, and her honoring of her husband could only be after he had been cremated. The most natural way to take ἂν ἠγάπων is as a present contrary-to-fact apodosis to a past contrary-to-fact protasis.

1049-56

Ελ. ἄκουσον, ἤν τι καὶ γυνὴ λέξῃ σοφόν.
βούλῃ λέγεσθαι μὴ θανὼν λόγῳ θανεῖν;
Με. κακὸς μὲν ὄρνις· εἰ δὲ κερδανῶ, λέγε·
ἕτοιμός εἰμι μὴ θανὼν λόγῳ θανεῖν.
Ελ. καὶ μὴν γυναικείοις ⟨σ'⟩ ἂν οἰκτισαίμεθα
κουραῖσι καὶ θρήνοισι πρὸς τὸν ἀνόσιον.
Με. σωτηρίας δὲ τοῦτ' ἔχει τί νῷν ἄκος;
παλαιότης γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ γ' ἔνεστί τις.

L's παλαιότης γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ γ' ἔνεστί τις in 1056 has been defended as an extra-dramatic comment. 'The story seems a bit old', says Menelaus, giving his audience a chance to laugh at an allusion to the other heroes in tragedy (e.g. Orestes, Cresphontes) who secured life or revenge by being reported dead. This would then be one of the few places that contravene Taplin's Law, promulgated in

'Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A Synkrisis', *JHS* 106 (1986), 163-74, that tragedy never alludes to other tragedies.

A further problem is that this line is given as a reason (γὰρ) for his puzzled question in 1055: σωτηρίας δὲ τοῦτ' ἔχει τί νῷν ἄκος; The staleness of the idea does not explain why Menelaus has no idea what it has to do with saving their lives. On the contrary, if an idea is stale, the problem is that it is too obvious, not that it is opaque.

When we ask ourselves what the sense requires, we find that we do not expect Menelaus to say that the story is old (and hence one cannot see what it contributes to their goal) but rather that such a story seems *pointless*. Read ματαιότης (Cobet).

1227-31

Ελ. ἐν εὐμαρεῖ γοῦν σὴν κασιγνήτην λαθεῖν.
Θε. οὐ δῆτα. πῶς οὖν; τόνδ' ἔτ' οἰκήσεις τάφον; 1228
Ελ. πιστὴ γάρ εἰμι τῷ πόσει φεύγουσα σέ. 1230
Θε. τί κερτομεῖς με, τὸν θανόντα δ' οὐκ ἐᾷς; 1229
Ελ. ἀλλ' οὐκέτ'· ἤδη δ' ἄρχε τῶν ἐμῶν γάμων. 1231

1229 et 1230 inter se trai. Jackson, mutatis personis 1230 εἰμι τῷ . . . φεύγουσα σέ Jackson: ἐσσὶ (εἶ σὺ Elmsley) σῷ . . . φεύγουσά με L

Jackson, *MS* 25-6, transposed 1229 and 1230, giving 1230 to Helen and 1229 to Theoclymenus, and readjusted some endings and pronouns to fit the new assignments. The changes are few in number and satisfyingly interconnected: once the transposition happened, it is plausible to suppose that all the other changes were deliberately made to deal with obvious difficulties. It is certainly true, as Jackson says, that 1229 belongs to Theoclymenus, who is the one to ask that the dead be left alone. But 1230 is a bit unnatural in Helen's mouth. Why should she pretend obduracy only to reverse herself suddenly in her very next line? And why does Theoclymenus describe such obduracy, which he has no reason to think is not genuine, by the verb κερτομεῖν, which means either 'provoke' or 'befool'? There is just enough wrong here to query whether Jackson's version is what Euripides wrote.

Willink, in a personal communication, suggests keeping the transmitted order but marking lacunae before 1229 and 1230. The trick, he implies, will be filling the lacunae, as is clear when we contemplate the following.

Θε. οὐ δῆτα. πῶς οὖν; τόνδ' ἔτ' οἰκήσεις τάφον;
⟨Ελ. ⟩
Θε. τί κερτομεῖς με, τὸν θανόντα δ' οὐκ ἐᾷς;
⟨Ελ. ⟩
Θε. πιστὴ γὰρ εἶ σὺ σῷ πόσει φεύγουσά με.
Ελ. ἀλλ' οὐκέτ'· ἤδη δ' ἄρχε τῶν ἐμῶν γάμων.

What could Helen have said that would call forth Theoclymenus' two responses? We do not want Helen to confuse matters by untimely refusal of Theoclymenus' hand. But we want a delaying action before the final surrender of 1231, perhaps in slightly ambiguous language so that Theoclymenus is not quite sure what she means. I suggest something like the following:

Θε. οὐ δῆτα. πῶς οὖν; τόνδ' ἔτ' οἰκήσεις τάφον;
⟨Ελ. θανὼν ἔτ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνος· οὐ τιμητέος;⟩ 1228a
Θε. τί κερτομεῖς με, τὸν θανόντα δ' οὐκ ἐᾷς;
⟨Ελ. οὗ πόσις, ἐκεῖ γυναῖκα συνναίειν χρεών.⟩ 1229a
Θε. πιστὴ γὰρ εἶ σὺ σῷ πόσει φεύγουσά με;
Ελ. ἀλλ' οὐκέτ'· ἤδη δ' ἄρχε τῶν ἐμῶν γάμων.

1228a means 'My husband still lives, though dead: must I not honor him?' Theoclymenus might well feel that this was κερτομία, an attempt to confuse or provoke him. 1229a is likewise somewhat vague, and Theoclymenus naturally asks for clarification, thereby preparing the way for Helen's unambiguous answer in 1231. Jackson's insight that 1229 belongs to Theoclymenus is saved, but we do not have Helen saying *expressis verbis* that she will go on inhabiting Proteus' tomb only to reverse herself two lines later.

1252-5

Θε. πῶς τοὺς θανόντας θάπτετ' ἐν πόντῳ νεκρούς;
Με. ὡς ἂν παρούσης οὐσίας ἕκαστος ᾖ.
Θε. πλούτου λέγ' οὕνεχ' ὅ τι θέλεις ταύτης χάριν.
Με. προσφάζεται μὲν αἷμα πρῶτα νερτέροις.

What does ταύτης χάριν modify? 'Say for her sake'? 'Want for her sake'? Neither is particularly plausible. Dale's explanation raises misgivings: 'ταύτης χάριν goes with an implied "I do not grudge it".' That is what we might expect, but it is hard to get it out of the Greek. In another context ταύτης χάριν would imply that Theoclymenus is being open-handed because of his love for Helen and offering, for her sake, whatever the sailor wants. That context can be restored if we read λάβ' for λέγ': 'Where wealth is concerned, take whatever you like for her sake'.

1646-56

οὐ γὰρ πεπρωμένοισιν ὀργίζῃ γάμοις·
οὐδ' ἡ θεᾶς Νηρῇδος ἔκγονος κόρη
ἀδικεῖ σ' ἀδελφὴ Θεονόη, τὰ τῶν θεῶν
τιμῶσα πατρός τ' ἐνδίκους ἐπιστολάς.
[εἰς μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ τὸν παρόντα νῦν χρόνον
κείνην κατοικεῖν σοῖσιν ἐν δόμοις ἐχρῆν.
ἐπεὶ δὲ Τροίας ἐξανεστάθη βάθρα
καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς παρέσχε τοὔνομ', οὐκέτι·
ἐν τοῖσι δ' αὑτοῖς δεῖ νιν ἐζεῦχθαι γάμοις
ἐλθεῖν τ' ἐς οἴκους καὶ συνοικῆσαι πόσει.]
ἀλλ' ἴσχε μὲν σῆς συγγόνου μέλαν ξίφος, κτλ.

1650-5 del. Willink (iam 1653 Nauck, 1653-4 Harberton)

1650-5 are intrusive since they stand between Castor's denial that Theonoe is in the wrong and his order to Theoclymenus to desist from attacking her, and they treat a tangentially related but different topic, the role fate played in Helen's stay in Egypt. But apart from 1650, which makes no sense and ought to be regarded as corrupt,

there is nothing wrong with the lines and quite a bit that is Euripidean. The point they seem to be making, that it is fated for Helen to remain only for a time in Egypt, is one that is highly relevant to the topic announced in 1646. Hence rather than delete five lines that are blameless along with one that is corrupt, I prefer to emend 1650 and make the passage follow 1646, a line which calls for an explanation. Read, with H. Cron, οὐ μὲν γὰρ αἰεί, τὸν παρόντα δ' ἐς χρόνον, and Castor thus explains why the marriage causing Theoclymenus' anger is one not destined to be.

PHOENISSAE[1]

21-31

ὁ δ' ἡδονῇ 'νδοὺς ἔς τε βακχείαν πεσὼν
ἔσπειρεν ἡμῖν παῖδα, καὶ σπείρας †βρέφος†
γνοὺς τἀμπλάκημα τοῦ θεοῦ τε τὴν φάτιν,
λειμῶν' ἐς Ἥρας καὶ Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας
δίδωσι βουκόλοισιν ἐκθεῖναι βρέφος
[σφυρῶν σιδηρᾶ κέντρα διαπείρας μέσων·
ὅθεν νιν Ἑλλὰς ὠνόμαζεν Οἰδίπουν].
Πολύβου δέ νιν λαβόντες ἱπποβουκόλοι
φέρουσ' ἐς οἴκους ἔς τε δεσποίνης χέρας
ἔθηκαν. ἡ δὲ τὸν ἐμὸν ὠδίνων πόνον
μαστοῖς ὑφεῖτο καὶ πόσιν πείθει τεκεῖν.

21 'νδοὺς Markland: δοὺς codd. et $^{i}\Sigma^{mbvc}$ et Ar. $^{i}\Sigma$ Ach. 263 22 βρέφος] om. gE (20-2 citatis); γόνον Wecklein, τάλας Hartung, λέχους Schoene 26-7 del. Paley (27 iam Valckenaer) 31 τρέφειν Nagel

There are four areas of uncertainty. (1) In 21 Renehan, *CP* 93 (1998), 180-1, makes a case on the basis of some late authors (Plutarch, Philostratus, Alciphron) for retaining the simplex δοὺς in the intransitive sense 'yield to'. But it remains true that this is without parallel in the classical period. In the preface to his edition of Manilius Housman said that he was sometimes led 'to err on the side of caution, and timidly to alter what I might without rashness have defended'. Some may find Housman's implication that alteration can be a timid procedure and defense a rash one to be mere paradox, but there are times when defense seems riskier than alteration. That seems to be the case here.

---

1 Throughout this chapter the abbreviation 'M.' refers to D. J. Mastronarde's commentary on *Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1994). Since I will find myself taking issue with it repeatedly, I record here my admiration for its learning, acumen, and sobriety.

(2) In 22 M. prints the text without daggers. D. argues (his *Euripidea* 358) on the basis of *Hec.* 25-6, *HF* 33 and S. *OT* 1404 that normal style in such a repetition would be to repeat the verbal stem (as a participle) but not the object. Furthermore, the variation παῖδα . . . βρέφος seems pointless. And βρέφος comes at line-end three lines later, an awkward repetition. But none of the conjectures D. lists is quite convincing. Wecklein's is merely a different and equally pointless variation. Hartung's introduces pathos into this otherwise objective narrative at a point where it is not wanted. Two things are wrong with Schoene's λέχους. Strong pause before the last iamb of a trimeter is avoided by Euripides and should not be introduced by emendation (see Wilamowitz on *HF* 280). Furthermore, Fraenkel (on *Ag.* 637) has shown that an anarthrous possessive genitive dependent on a second noun with article should be in attributive position. There are few parallels for ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν and none for θεῶν ἡ τιμή, so that λέχους τὸ ἀμπλάκημα is highly unlikely to be what Euripides wrote. The same two objections apply to the anonymous conjecture φρενὸς, reported in Wecklein's appendix. Herwerden's πατὴρ, not mentioned by D. but adopted by Craik, is immune to these objections and produces a sentence that reads tolerably well with the change of a single suspicious word. I have adopted it.

It may, however, be worthwhile to consider another possibility. Not all is quite straightforward in 23. M. says of γνοὺς with its two objects, 'either a light zeugma "recognizing his error and understanding (the full import, the applicability of) the god's saying" or hendiadys of the two nouns "recognizing his error through application of the god's warning"'. The first seems grammatically easier but worse sense: there is no difficulty about recognizing the import of an oracle as plain as the one to Laius. The second doesn't seem like a hendiadys at all but another zeugma. If pressed we could extract acceptable sense by translating (zeugmatically) 'recognizing his mistake and (recollecting) the god's oracle', but we might also consider that this clumsy line could be interpolated, as suggested by Zipperer. If so, Euripides might have written the following:

> ὁ δ' ἡδονῇ 'νδοὺς ἔς τε βακχείαν πεσὼν
> ἔσπειρεν ἡμῖν παῖδα, καὶ σπείρας βρέφος
> λειμῶν' ἐς Ἥρας καὶ Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας

δίδωσι βουκόλοισιν ἐκθεῖναι πατήρ.

'But he yielded to pleasure in a drunken moment and sired our child, and having done so, the father gave the babe to herdsmen to expose in Hera's meadow on rocky Cithaeron.' Replacing βρέφος in 25 with πατήρ was suggested by Camper as a way of eliminating the repetition of βρέφος at line end at such a short interval. Now the first βρέφος can be taken as the object of δίδωσι. The sense is improved. The phrase ἔσπειρεν ἡμῖν παῖδα refers to Laius' siring of a son, the act of sexual intercourse that produced him. The participle repeats this notion, and then βρέφος takes us to the next stage, the child not only begotten but born. βρέφος now is not otiose. The pause before the last iamb of 22 is slighter, the mere passage from participial phrase to object of main verb, and we don't have to accept any other anomalies with it, as we did in the case of λέχους and φρενὸς. It could be argued that this text is more open to obvious corruption than the one I adopt in the Loeb.

What was the origin of the error? The repeated βρέφος at line-end is probably a mechanical error, though it is possible that someone deliberately introduced it: once 23 had been interpolated, it no longer felt as if δίδωσι had an object. It is hard to divine the motive for the insertion of 23. It may have originated in another play and been put here by an actor. It may be an *ad hoc* invention to supply what the interpolator felt needed spelling out. One-line interpolations, made for reasons that are now obscure, have been detected elsewhere in Euripides: cf. *Alc*. 795-6 (two half-lines from elsewhere pointlessly added), *Med*. 87, 785, 1221, *Andr*. 810, 878, 1151, *Hec*. 490, 504, 967 (deletion argued at *Eur. Alt*. 67-8), *El*. 360, *IT* 349, 1155, *Hel*. 416 (Bothe's deletion is certainly attractive), 771, 1008, 1197, *Pho*. 11, 387, 436, 548, *Or*. 1394, etc. In most of these cases it is difficult to see why anyone felt compelled to add explanation. Yet add it they did (in some instances deletion is confirmed by absence from papyrus fragments). Here perhaps the author of the line may have felt that Laius' two actions were discrepant and the discrepancy called for an explanation.

(3) (4) Two problems must be treated together: do we delete 26-7 and do we adopt Nagel's τρέφειν in 31? A 'no' to the second means a 'yes' to the first, for if the queen of Corinth really 'convinces her

husband she has given birth' by presenting him with a child her servants have found on Mt. Cithaeron, he must not be disfigured as described in 26, otherwise Polybus cannot possibly be convinced.[1] So if we read τεκεῖν in 31, we must delete 26-7.

This is the pair of answers adopted by D. But objection can be raised to both. It is at this point in the narrative, when the birth and exposure of Oedipus have been narrated, that we expect to learn his name, and 26-7 give us what we would expect to find. By contrast, to introduce his name only at 50 seems rather casual. An examination of Euripides' prologues establishes this principle: if a character's name is to be mentioned at all (as that of Demophon or the Old Man in *Electra* are not), it is given at his first mention.[2] Objections against the two lines are not fatal. The most worrying is the contradiction between 26 and 805, where the pins are of gold, but M. shows that such contraditions can be found elsewhere in Euripides. Since the lines give us what we expect here and since there is no insuperable objection of style against them, they should be retained.

That leaves the problem of πείθει τεκεῖν (mss.) or τρέφειν (Nagel) in 31. It is equally good Greek to construe πείθω with infinitive as indirect statement or as analogous to indirect command (Euripides in fact favors the second, and I can find only *Rhes.* 838 as an example of the first). If we read τεκεῖν, we have a little intrigue whereby a childless woman palms off on her husband a child that is not his. It is not clear why the poet should have changed the usual story of Polybus and Merope since the change has no effect on the rest of the play and contributes nothing to the prologue except a bit of domestic duplicity. The woman 'persuades' her husband that she has given birth. How? By putting the child to her breast? By contrast, if we want to see the work πείθει should be doing we have only to look at Soph. *OT* 1023-4: in answer to Oedipus' question why Laius called Oedipus his son though he was not his real father, the Messen-

[1] This is denied by M., p. 84, who says 'Eur. is free to give as little detail as he wishes about such a matter, and if the audience troubles itself . . . to fill in other details of the story, it must do so in some way which respects the details provided'. But there is simply no remotely plausible way in which a woman can claim she has given birth to a child whose ankles have been pierced by iron pins.

[2] There is one exception, and it proves the rule: Hermes gives Ion's name at the end of the prologue in the act of conferring it on him. In *Alcestis*, by contrast, Apollo does not mention the name of Alcestis at all.

ger says ἡ γὰρ πρὶν αὐτὸν ἐξέπεισ' ἀπαιδία. In our passage too Laius is persuaded by his childlessness (here urged by his wife) to raise a child that is not his (and is also disfigured). Read τρέφειν therefore in 31 and retain 26-7.

33-8

> παῖς οὑμὸς ἢ γνοὺς ἤ τινος μαθὼν πάρα
> ἔστειχε τοὺς φύσαντας ἐκμαθεῖν θέλων
> πρὸς δῶμα Φοίβου, Λάιός θ' οὑμὸς πόσις
> τὸν ἐκτεθέντα παῖδα μαστεύων μαθεῖν
> εἰ μηκέτ' εἴη, καὶ ξυνάπτετον πόδα
> ἐς ταὐτὸν ἄμφω Φωκίδος σχιστῆς ὁδοῦ.

Can the phrase Φωκίδος σχιστῆς ὁδοῦ mean a crossroads? It is a reasonable enough idea in itself: in Greek or Latin 'a split road' could easily mean 'a splitting of the road' just as *Caesar occisus* can mean 'the slaying of Caesar'. But (1) in the present passage it is hard to take it so, and (2) other evidence seems to suggest that σχιστὴ ὁδός was the name not of an intersection but of a stretch of road leading from Daulis to Delphi.

(1) In the present passage Oedipus and Laius are making their way, for different reasons but on the same road, to Delphi. Laius is in a chariot and overtakes Oedipus, who is on foot. It is not the case that they meet at the crossroads. Rather 'they join footstep', i.e. their paths converge, at the same point on the Phocian Split Way (ἐς ταὐτὸν . . . ὁδοῦ).[1] M. correctly explains the genitive as partitive, and this would suggest the above translation of σχιστὴ ὁδός: 'at some point in the crossroad' would be implausibly minute since a crossroad is only a few yards wide.[2] Apparently, however, M. would not translate as I suggest: the genitive, he says, 'indicates that the name applies to the neighbourhood of the crossroads', and he compares S. *OT* 800-1, τριπλῆς ὅτ' ἦ κελεύθου . . . πέλας. That passage, how-

[1] This is basically the translation of E. Wyckoff in the Chicago series: 'at the same spot in the split road of Phocis'. Craik, by contrast, translates as if 'split road' were in apposition to 'spot': 'And they joined step at the same point, both of them, the forked path of Phokis'.

[2] Taken thus by Méridier in the Budé series: 'au même endroit d'un chemin qui bifurque'.

ever, uses 'triple road' to mean 'crossroads', not 'neighborhood of a crossroads': the neighborhood is indicated by the adverb πέλας. It therefore gives no help in supporting M.'s meaning 'their paths converged at some point in [the neighborhood of] the Splitting of the Ways' and suggests that we should see whether the Φωκὶς σχιστὴ ὁδός might not be a road rather than an intersection. Is there other evidence for this?

(2) Pausanias (10.5.3) says[1] 'Going forward from here you will come to a road called the Cleft Road, the very road on which Oedipus slew his father', i.e. the σχιστὴ ὁδός is a road with the name σχιστή. A little later (10.5.4) it is said that the tomb of Laius and his servant are to be found 'in the very middle of the place where the three roads meet' (ἐν μεσαιτάτῳ τῆς τριόδου). Pausanias seems to distinguish the σχιστὴ ὁδός from the crossroads. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 5.231, says 'The meeting of the three roads—the road from Daulis, the road from Delphi, and the road from Thebes—is the Cleft Way or Triple Road . . .' Later he cites S. *OT* 733-4, Φωκὶς μὲν ἡ γῆ κλῄζεται, σχιστὴ δ' ὁδὸς / ἐς ταὐτὸ Δελφῶν κἀπὸ Δαυλίας ἄγει. Sophocles, of course, mentions a crossroads (τριπλαῖς ἁμαξιτοῖς 716 and 730, τρεῖς κέλευθοι 1398), but here the σχιστὴ ὁδός is apparently a road that leads in either direction to (the Greek says 'from') Delphi and Daulia. It would seem that the expression denotes not the splitting of a road into two but a road 'cloven' (by nature) through a mountainous countryside. The same conclusion is suggested by Aeschylus, fr. 387a R:

ἐπῆμεν τῆς ὁδοῦ τροχήλατον
σχιστῆς κελεύθου τρίοδον, ἔνθα συμβολὰς
τριῶν κελεύθων Ποτνιάδας ἠμείβομεν

The text is probably corrupt (see Radt's apparatus), but if σχιστῆς κελεύθου meant a crossroads, it would duplicate the meaning of τρίοδον, and the passage would absurdly mention a crossroads three times in two lines. It seems, therefore, that there is no objection to translating *Pho.* 37-8 as 'and their paths coincided at a point on Phocis' Cloven Way'.

---

[1] Loeb translation of W. H. S. Jones, vol. 4, p. 391.

396-9

Ιο. αἱ δ' ἐλπίδες βόσκουσι φυγάδας, ὡς λόγος.
Πο. καλοῖς βλέπουσαί γ' ὄμμασιν, μέλλουσι δέ.
Ιο. οὐδ' ὁ χρόνος αὐτὰς διεσάφησ' οὔσας κενάς;
Πο. ἔχουσιν Ἀφροδίτην τιν' ἡδεῖαν κακῶν.

399 Ἀφροδίτην] ἀφροσύνην Blaydes ἡδεῖαν] εὐδίαν Jackson κακῶν] νόσον Musgrave: θεόν Sγρ, Aldina ἔχουσί γ' anonymus, qui h. v. ante 398 trai., ὁ δὲ χρόνος scribens

In 399 the lemma is the transmitted ἡδεῖαν rather than Jackson's conjecture εὐδίαν (*MS* 158-9), printed by D. I have also listed in my apparatus a few additional conjectures culled from the Wecklein appendix.

The phrase Ἀφροδίτην τιν' ἡδεῖαν κακῶν is a difficult one, and I know of no explanation that is immune to objection. M. renders the line 'hopes have (contain, afford) a certain sweet compulsive desire for evils', i.e. 'hopes compel one to be pleasantly in love with evils'. Without his further explanation, one is tempted to reply, 'No, hope does not cause us to be in love with evils but to imagine that we will escape them'. M. sees the force of this and offers the explanation that κακῶν refers 'not to the evils of exile but to the evils which attend upon delusive hope'. I cannot see in this context how anyone reading or hearing the line could so understand it: Polynices and Jocasta have been talking a great deal about κακά (cf. κακόν 388, δυσχερές 390, λυπρόν 394), and what they have been referring to are the evils of exile. Other ways of taking it, discussed by M., are no more plausible. We cannot import into Ἀφροδίτη the idea of 'soothing' or 'charming away' evils (which would anyway vitiate the oxymoron in ἡδεῖαν κακῶν).

What about Jackson's εὐδίαν? That is not wholly satisfactory either. The word means 'fair weather', and with κακῶν would mean 'respite from, cessation of'. But M. finds unconvincing the sense 'a certain charm, <which is or which produces> a tranquil freedom from one's troubles'. It is not easy, as M. says, to supply what Jackson's conjecture requires. Furthermore, one would expect Ἀφροδίτην τιν' to be modified in some way that would indicate its precise

metaphorical sense. 'They have a certain 'Αφροδίτη', even when the goddess's name is followed by an appositive, is somewhat vague.

All this raises a more general question: what kind of ἐλπίδες are we talking about anyway, and what attitudes toward them are being taken here? Jocasta and Polynices are supposed to be having a discussion in stichomythia. That would imply a degree of contrast in their points of view. In theory, Jocasta's 'Exiles feed on hope, they say' could be a disparagement of hope, and Polynices' 399 could explain 'why the delays which prove hope to be delusive have not caused him to abandon his hopes' (M.).[1] But the most natural reading is that in 396 Jocasta is recommending to her son the consolations of hope and that he in 397 is rejecting them on the ground that hopes are deceitful, slow to come true. Hope here is not the active hope that leads one to undertake risky ventures but the more passive variety that allows one to wait and see. Jocasta seems to be suggesting to her son that exile is not so bad (cf. 388, 390), and that if he waits in the hope of a future change of fortunes he need not go to war against Thebes. Polynices rejects this advice.

Yet in 399, in its transmitted or emended form, he seems to be saying that hope is a good thing. Equally odd, Jocasta in 398 seems to be saying that hope is vain. This suggests an obvious remedy, transposition of 398 and 399:

Ιο. αἱ δ' ἐλπίδες βόσκουσι φυγάδας, ὡς λόγος.
Πο. καλοῖς βλέπουσαί γ' ὄμμασιν, μέλλουσι δέ.
Ιο. ἔχουσιν 'Αφροδίτην τιν' ἡδεῖαν κακῶν. 399
Πο. οὐδ' ὁ χρόνος αὐτὰς διεσάφησ' οὔσας κενάς; 398

This transposition was suggested nearly two centuries ago by an anonym who called himself Cantabrigiensis in *The Classical Journal* (London).[2] The new setting suggests a slightly different way of taking 399. The κακά in question are those under discussion, the troubles attendant upon exile. Hopes, says Jocasta, make one pleasantly in love with these troubles, not in the sense of ἐρᾶν but of στέργειν

---

[1] This is apparently inconsistent with M.'s interpretation of κακῶν, according to which hope leads one to pursue things that turn out to be evil. That would be no way to defend ἐλπίδες.

[2] See *ClJ* 2 (1810), 892-3. According to D.'s app. crit. on *Pho.* 924 the author was not Elmsley.

or ἀγαπᾶν. This is an Ἀφροδίτη κακῶν, to be sure, but paradoxically a pleasant one. The line may stand as transmitted, and neither ἔχουσί γ', suggested by anonymus, nor ἔχουσι δ', my preferred alternative, is strictly necessary, though either is a paleographically slight change and could be right.

In 398 Polynices' aorist is now a simple past, not a gnomic aorist: 'But hasn't time shown them up as empty?' The sense of οὐδέ seems a bit unusual, but for οὐδέ at the beginning of a question with some degree of adversative feel see *HF* 616, *Ion* 328, 956, *Pho*. 404, *Or*. 429, 1056, *Ba*. 615, and also possibly *Hi*. 1055 and *Andr*. 79 (perhaps mistranslated by me in vol. 2, pp. 225 and 281). Cantabrigiensis suggests ὁ δὲ χρόνος, with declarative punctuation, another slight change. If any change is necessary, we could get excellent sense by changing the first letter in the line to an epsilon: εὖ δ' ὁ χρόνος αὐτὰς διεσάφησ' οὔσας κενάς, 'But time has *plentifully* shown their emptiness'. For εὖ, 'thoroughly', see *Cy*. 237, *Alc*. 548, *Hi*. 504, *El*. 694, *Hel*. 712, and *Pho*. 991. Alternatively, change οὐδ' to οὐχ, as suggested to me by D.

408-21

Ιο. πῶς δ' ἦλθες Ἄργος; τίν' ἐπίνοιαν ἔσχεθες;
Πο. ἔχρησ' Ἀδράστῳ Λοξίας χρησμόν τινα.
Ιο. ποῖον; τί τοῦτ' ἔλεξας; οὐκ ἔχω μαθεῖν.
Πο. κάπρῳ λέοντί θ' ἁρμόσαι παίδων γάμους.
Ιο. καὶ σοὶ τί θηρῶν ὀνόματος μετῆν, τέκνον;
Πο. οὐκ οἶδ'· ὁ δαίμων μ' ἐκάλεσεν πρὸς τὴν τύχην.
Ιο. σοφὸς γὰρ ὁ θεός· τίνι τρόπῳ δ' ἔσχες λέχος;
Πο. νὺξ ἦν, Ἀδράστου δ' ἦλθον ἐς παραστάδας.
Ιο. κοίτας ματεύων, ἢ φυγὰς πλανώμενος;
Πο. ἦν ταῦτα· κᾳτά γ' ἦλθεν ἄλλος αὖ φυγάς.
Ιο. τίς οὗτος; ὡς ἄρ' ἄθλιος κἀκεῖνος ἦν.
Πο. Τυδεύς, ὃν Οἰνέως φασὶν ἐκφῦναι πατρός.
Ιο. τί θηρσὶν ὑμᾶς δῆτ' Ἄδραστος ᾔκασεν;
Πο. στρωμνῆς ἐς ἀλκὴν οὕνεκ' ἤλθομεν πέρι.

post 408 trai. 413-4 Jacobs, vix recte

Since M.'s defense[1] of the transmitted order and his rejection of Jacobs' transposition has convinced D., I must say briefly why I think Jacobs is right. There are two arguments: (1) 413-4 are needed where Jacobs puts them; and (2) they are ruinous in their transmitted position after 412.

(1) With the transmitted order Jocasta asks her son how he got to Argos, and he answers. The answer starts, as M. points out, *ab ovo*, in itself not a suspicious procedure in a stichomythic narration. But the history that he outlines (oracle to Adrastus, Polynices' visit to Adrastus' forecourt, the arrival of Tydeus, their quarrel) fails to yield any answer to Jocasta's question. The correct answer is 'I don't know: heaven may have had a hand in it'. That is what 413 says, and it is needed here. And τίνι τρόπῳ δ' ἔσχες λέχος; (414) asks the question answered by the whole history that begins in 409.

(2) By contrast, in their transmitted place after 412, 413-4 are ruinous. 412 asks why the oracle about marrying his daughters to wild beasts came to be applied to Polynices. With the transmitted order Polynices says he does not know, but 420-1 show that he does. M. attempts to meet this second point by claiming that 412, καὶ σοὶ τί θηρῶν ὀνόματος μετῆν, τέκνον; and 421, τί θηρσὶν ὑμᾶς δῆτ' Ἄδραστος ᾔκασεν; are two different questions with different answers. Polynices' 'I don't know' to the first shows that he is ignorant of what there was about him that caused him to be named as a beast in the oracle, while in the second he answers why *Adrastus* equated him with a beast. This seems an overly fine distinction, and there is nothing in 412 to show that it is about Polynices' essential character in contrast to the accident of Adrastus' inference about him. That 420 is essentially the same question as 412 is shown by the resumptive δῆτα, 'so', getting down to the point of the question raised eight lines ago after an intervening narrative.

In short, with the transmitted order Polynices answers 'I don't know' to a question for which there is an answer known to him and attempts (but without relevance) to answer a question for which there is none. With Jacobs' rearrangement, where there is an answer, he gives one, and it is only where there is not that he says 'I don't know'. The tradition supplied no motivation for Polynices' journey

---

[1] Donald J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage* (Berkeley, 1979), pp. 48-51.

to Argos, and Jocasta is made to ask the reason for it merely to show that it is an event without a clear cause in the human realm whose result shows the influence of divinity. (Cf. M. on *Pho.* 33 and my Loeb introduction, p. 209.)[1]

Only one of M.'s arguments against transposition seems to have any merit, but even that is double-edged. He says, 'Line 414 makes excellent sense in the transmitted position (less good sense in Jacobs' order) because with 409 in the background ὁ θεός can be referred to Apollo'. But with Jacobs' transposition Jocasta could be making a general remark about the ability of heaven to bring about results it wants, or equally she could have Apollo explicitly in mind since the prologue shows her awareness of Apollo's hand at work. So the sense is 'less good' only in that it is less unambiguously specific. By contrast, in its transmitted place ὁ θεός refers unambiguously to Apollo, but the whole couplet is now harder to make sense of: how can Polynices say that heaven (ὁ δαίμων) called him to his fate in connection with an oracle whose applicability to himself he cannot see (and on M.'s interpretation seems to dispute)? And how can Jocasta say that the god is clever when no evidence of his cleverness has been presented, the meaning of his oracle not have been elucidated? I conclude that Jacobs' transposition is almost certainly correct.

438-42

[πάλαι μὲν οὖν ὑμνηθέν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐρῶ·
τὰ χρήματ' ἀνθρώποισι τιμιώτατα,
δύναμίν τε πλείστην τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἔχει.
ἁγὼ μεθήκω δεῦρο μυρίαν ἄγων
λόγχην· πένης γὰρ οὐδὲν εὐγενὴς ἀνήρ.]

438-42 del. Leidloff et olim Hartung (1837)

I agree with D.'s decision to delete here and feel that a word or two in reply to M.'s spirited defense may be in order. M. says that in the traditional Greek value system honor, power, and wealth are in-

[1] Note the same features in Statius, *Theb.* 1.326-8, where Polynices' journey to Argos is ascribed either to an Erinys, or to chance, or to fate.

separable, that Polynices has shown concern for all three, and that only a desire to make him more simplistically good lies behind the deletion of 438-42. But, in the first place, people defending traditional aristocratic values generally mute the importance of money, preferring to ascribe a strong desire for it to their enemies. Cf. Theognis, who claims that his enemies are base and rich while he is noble and poor, and Alcaeus, whose χρήματ' ἄνηρ is a protest against an unjust world. For Polynices to speak in superlatives about money would mean he was taking a position highly uncharacteristic of the traditional aristocrat. Second, Polynices' motives elsewhere are desire for his fatherland and its familiar haunts (366-70). To this are added the exile's lack of freedom and his powerlessness to resist the follies of others (390-5). Nowhere does Polynices explicitly complain of lack of money, and the problem of how to find his livelihood is explicitly confined to the period before his marriage (400). His money problems are now over, and for him to exalt money as the highest power among mortals means that he deliberatedly avows a motive usually left unspoken when a more presentable one is available. There is no reason for him to do this, and if Euripides intended him to be a complex character with variegated motivation, there is no reason for him to speak contemptuously of money, as he does at 597.

515-7

> χρῆν δ' αὐτὸν οὐχ ὅπλοισι τὰς διαλλαγάς,
> μῆτερ, ποιεῖσθαι· πᾶν γὰρ ἐξαιρεῖ λόγος
> ὃ καὶ σίδηρος πολεμίων δράσειεν ἄν.

On ἐξαιρεῖ LSJ s.v. IV.2 says 'bring to an end, accomplish', citing only this passage. That at least makes some kind of sense in context:[1] 'He ought not to be making his truce by force of arms, mother: for speech (reason) accomplishes everything that enemy swords could do'. Yet 'bring to an end, accomplish' is rather far from the other meanings of ἐξαιρέω, and the uniqueness of the citation is suspicious. Furthermore, the claim that Polynices should have talked

[1] Contrast M.'s 'Speech captures full well every goal', a translation that founders on δράσειεν ἄν.

with Eteocles rather than taken up arms, and that he could have hoped to get everything that arms could have gotten him by so doing, is at odds with Eteocles' brutally frank and amoralist stance (cf. 503) in this speech. The line gives imperfect sense imperfectly expressed.

Eteocles is not likely to have assured his brother that talking would have won him everything that arms could. But he has made the point that he would be ashamed to see his brother get what he wants by coming with an army (510-2), and he might well have made the related point that 'talking is nullified by everything enemy arms are able (i.e. are threatening) to do': perhaps read πᾶν γὰρ ἐξαιρεῖ λόγους.

546-8

εἶθ' ἥλιος μὲν νύξ τε δουλεύει μέτροις
σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀνέξῃ δωμάτων ἔχων ἴσον;
[καὶ τῷδ' ἀπονεῖμαι; κᾆτα ποῦ 'στιν ἡ δίκη;]

546 μέτροις Weil: βροτοῖς codd. (]ς Π[12]) et Oenom. ap. Euseb. praep. 6.7.30, Cels. ap. Orig. Cels. 4.77, Orig. ibid. 4.30, Isid. Pelus. (Migne 78.1113d), Theodoret. therap. 4.40, Doxop.: cf. Σ[mbvc] τῷ ἴσῳ 547 ἔχειν Rf et [s]XT et [γρ]Σ[mbvc] (ἐὰν γράφηται ἔχειν, καὶ ἀπονέμειν· ἐὰν δὲ ἔχων, καὶ ἀπονέμων) et Oenom., Theoret., Doxop.; [Π[12]] 548 del. Schoene ἀπονεῖμαι ΩZT[z] et Doxop.: -νέμειν PRfX et T[tγρ] et novit Σ[mbvc]: -νέμων A et növit Σ[mbvc], coni. Markland: [Π[12]]

This passage has two places where certainty seems impossible. (1) Shall we read βροτοῖς with the mss. and the secondary tradition or, relying perhaps on the scholiast's paraphrase, adopt Weil's μέτροις? At first glance the idea that the sun and the night sky 'are slaves to mortals' seems far-fetched, and the scholiast's paraphrase gives the color of plausibility to Weil's conjecture. But τῷ ἴσῳ is not an obvious paraphrase for μέτροις, and it is possible that the scholiast inserted this idea himself to reflect the larger context. In defense of βροτοῖς M. make two points. First, the idea that the heavens operate as they do for the service of man is to be found in fifth-century texts. Second, the paradoxical force of δουλεύει βροτοῖς gives much more point than the milder δουλεύει μέτροις to the parody by the comic

poet Strattis (*Phoen*. fr. 48 K.-A.), εἶθ' ἥλιος μὲν πείθεται τοῖς παιδίοις / ὅταν λέγωσιν 'ἔξεχ' ὦ φίλ' ἥλιε'. There may be a deliberate exaggeration of the efforts required of ἥλιος and νύξ in order to lessen by contrast what Jocasta is asking of Eteocles. I print βροτοῖς, though without certainty.

(2) Shall we retain 548? If so, in what form? External evidence for its spuriousness is slight since the omission by Oenomaus, not noted in D.'s apparatus, need not be significant, as M. argues. There is no obvious motive for its manufacture since 547 would look complete in itself and not invite any supplementation. To construe ἀνέξῃ with participle would be perfectly natural, and there would be no motive to introduce either of the infinitives (ἀπονέμειν and ἀπονεῖμαι) attested in the tradition. We can produce sense and account for what the tradition gives us on the following hypothesis. Euripides wrote ἔχων in 547 and καὶ τῷδε νεῖμαι in 548, the infinitive being construed with ἀνέξῃ and the participle subordinate to it. The prosaic ἀπονεῖμαι was accidentally substituted in most of the tradition for the simplex form. The force of καί, which Euripides intended as 'also', was misunderstood as 'and' in the later tradition, which generated the variants ἔχειν and ἀπονέμων. Either before or after this, ἀπονέμειν may have been excogitated to heal the anapest introduced when ἀπονεῖμαι replaced the simplex form. The only difficulty is the rarity of the simple prolative infinitive with ἀνέχομαι (only A. *Eu*. 914-5), though there are others with subject accusative, cited by M. Because of the absence from extant Euripides of this construction I retain 548 with some hesitation.

549-67

τί τὴν τυραννίδ', ἀδικίαν εὐδαίμονα,
τιμᾷς ὑπέρφευ καὶ μέγ' ἥγησαι τόδε;
περιβλέπεσθαι τίμιον; κενὸν μὲν οὖν.
ἢ πολλὰ μοχθεῖν πόλλ' ἔχων ἐν δώμασιν
βούλῃ; τί δ' ἔστι τὸ πλέον; ὄνομ' ἔχει μόνον·
ἐπεὶ τά γ' ἀρκοῦνθ' ἱκανὰ τοῖς γε σώφροσιν.
[οὔτοι τὰ χρήματ' ἴδια κέκτηνται βροτοί,
τὰ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἔχοντες ἐπιμελούμεθα·
ὅταν δὲ χρῄζωσ' αὔτ' ἀφαιροῦνται πάλιν·

ὁ δ' ὄλβος οὐ βέβαιος, ἀλλ' ἐφήμερος.]
ἄγ', ἤν σ' ἔρωμαι δύο λόγω προθεῖσ' ἅμα,
πότερα τυραννεῖν ἢ πόλιν σῶσαι θέλεις,
ἐρεῖς τυραννεῖν; ἢν δὲ νικήσῃ σ' ὅδε
Ἀργεῖά τ' ἔγχη δόρυ τὸ Καδμείων ἕλῃ;
[ὄψῃ δαμασθὲν ἄστυ Θηβαῖον τόδε,
ὄψῃ δὲ πολλὰς αἰχμαλωτίδας κόρας
βίᾳ πρὸς ἀνδρῶν πολεμίων πορθουμένας.]
δαπανηρὸς ἆρ' ὁ πλοῦτος ὃν ζητεῖς ἔχειν
[γενήσεται Θήβαισι, φιλότιμος δὲ σύ].

549-67 del. Kovacs 555-8 (quorum 555-7 sine fab. nom. tamquam Euripideos citat Plut. mor. 116A, Sophoclis fr. 85 Nauck [88 Pearson, Radt] subiunctos Stob. 4.31.104; 558 sine fab. nom. tamquam Euripideum Demetr. Phal. [FGrH 228 F 24] ap. Plut. mor. 1104A, sine fab. et poetae nom. Electrae versui 944 praescriptum Crantor ap. Sext. Emp. adv. math. 11.55) suspectos habuit Valckenaer (qui tantum 558 del.), del. Nauck (552-8 Zipperer) 562 interrogationis nota dist. et 563-5 del. Willink cl. Σ^m (ἐὰν δὲ νικήσῃ σε οὗτος, τί; λείπει δὲ τὸ τί); ad ellipsin cf. 724, 1562-4, [1684], Andr. 845, Herc. 1202, IT 750, Or. 775 v. del. Harberton, denuo Murray nota interrogationis v. 561 distinguens cl. Σ^m 567 del. Valckenaer (566-7 Dindorf)

At *GRBS* 23 (1982), 42-5, I argued for the wholesale deletion of these lines, given above with D.'s partial deletions. M., pp. 307-8 plus subsequent remarks *ad loc.*, shows that many of the arguments I put forward have less probative force than I thought. But he does not persuade me that the passage is genuine, and so I here try to restate the argument.

Jocasta has been replying to Eteocles' speech, in which he takes the position that justice and equality are mere names with no real existence in the world and that he is justified in seizing the greater share, kingship or tyranny. He would not be a man, he says, if he let his brother tell him what to do. If he can be the ruler, why should he be a slave to, ruled by, his brother? Kingship is the greatest thing in the world, worth fighting for and worth committing injustice and impiety for.

It is to this position that Jocasta replies in 528-48. Ambition ruins the good fortunes of cities and houses, but equality and justice preserve them. The very structure of the universe reflects this principle

of equality since the sun and the night sky share the heavens equally in their yearly round and serve the common good by their obedience, and it is absurd for Eteocles to refuse to submit to a rule obeyed by these great ones. Despite the democratic overtones of ἰσότης, Jocasta does not mean that Eteocles should become a mere private citizen but that he should share rule equally with his brother, the two of them, like the day and the night, being of equal eminence in Thebes.

In 549-58, by contrast, the subject is the undesirability of tyranny itself. This suggests that Eteocles should become a private citizen, even though there has not been and will not be any talk of this in the rest of the play: Polynices has demanded that Eteocles keep his part of the bargain by sharing the kingship, not by retiring into private life. M. might reply (he doesn't take up this part of my argument) that Jocasta here disparages kingship not to induce Eteocles to give it up entirely but as a kind of *a fortiori* argument: Eteocles is a fool to pursue undivided kingship since kingship in any form is a fool's game. In the absence, however, of any explicit guidance to the audience to take it that way, I do not think it likely. These lines argue that Eteocles should not seek kingship at all, and this is at odds with the rest of the play.

Suspicion grows when we look at the first two lines with a critical eye. Jocasta is made to express surprise that Eteocles honors kingship when kingship is an ἀδικία εὐδαίμων. Yet neither the adjective nor the noun would impress Eteocles. He realizes he is committing an ἀδικία in order to win the throne. He would not concede but would insist that it confers εὐδαιμονία, prosperity and blessedness. In view of this, the question 'Why do you honor a blessed injustice?' lacks point. This phrase would have no effect on Eteocles but to confirm him in the choice he had already made. Again, M. could say that the absence of fit between Jocasta's and Eteocles' positions is part of the drama of this scene. I remain unconvinced that this is Euripides' manner.

Two things in the second line are suspicious, the perfect ἥγησαι with present sense, used by Herodotus but unexampled in Attic before Plato and plentiful thereafter, and the unmeaning *Füllsel* τόδε. Of the first M. says 'cf. νενόμικα used with similar force [i.e. to indicate a settled opinion] in Hdt., comedy, Plato. I see no serious cause for suspicion in the isolation of this usage in extant drama'.

But it is isolated, and that is not likely to be accidental in so common a verb as ἡγέομαι. That τόδε, referring only to τυραννίδα, is troubling can be seen from the attempts, rightly rejected by M., to remove it, Valckenaer's τί δὲ / περιβλέπεσθαι; τίμιον; and Porson's τὸ δὲ / περιβλέπεσθαι τίμιον; In defense of τόδε M. cites *Su.* 432 and *Hec.* 427, but in both cases context suggests an infinitive, plausibly represented by the neuter pronoun. By contrast *Su.* 444 is an exact parallel, and one cited by me, but since I argued for the spuriousness of *Su.* 442-55 (another passage about tyranny), I cited it to show that this loose use of τόδε was characteristic of interpolators. That passage contains two strong indications of late date (*art. cit.*, pp. 36-9), and hence its usefulness for the defense is slight. Yet it is the only passage M. cites that is truly parallel. M.'s defense has not clearly vindicated either usage. So in two lines we have two linguistically suspicious items and a phrase, ἀδικίαν εὐδαίμονα, that somehow misses the point. And the point itself—that kingship is not desirable at all—is one that does not really fit Jocasta's situation.

I alleged (*art. cit.*, p. 43) that the rejection of eminence in 551 'runs counter to the basic presuppositions of Greek thought in the classical period'. M. says that this represents 'a fatal oversimplification of the Greek ethical tradition, misrepresenting heroic and aristocratic ethics as the whole of a rich and ambiguous (even at times contradictory) system of values'. Undoubtedly my statement would have benefited by some qualifications. Achilles in Hades (*Od.* 11.487ff.) says that early death was too high a price to pay for κλέος, and Solon in Herodotus says (1.32) that men in private station may fare better than renowned and wealthy kings like Croesus. I still feel that there is some distance between such cautionary statements and the idea that κλέος and τιμή are worthless (κενόν), never ingredients in happiness.

To defend the next three lines, which say that wealth always involves toil, M. cites S. fr. 592, Solon fr. 24 W., Menander fr. 619 K.-T., 'Philetas' apud Stobaeus 4.33.19, and Horace *Odes* 3.1. The Solon fragment makes no such point but says that money is inferior to the enjoyments of life and that you cannot take money with you to the grave or escape death. Lloyd-Jones in the third Loeb Sophocles volume translates fr. 592 'But what pleasure comes from the many splendid things, if thought that gives bad counsel is to destroy the

wealth that makes life happy? . . . For the life of men is transformed by the cunning wiles of ruinous error that bring calamities at all seasons.' There πλοῦτος is actually called εὐαίων and supplies further evidence that contempt for wealth and position is not a characteristically fifth-century idea. The others are of Hellenistic or later date and are even so not very close.

The first part of the passage ends (555-8) with lines to the effect that mortals are not the real owners of their wealth but only its stewards, enjoying it on sufferance from the gods. Nauck deleted these and was followed by Fraenkel, D., and others. M., who deletes only 558, says that they are necessary to Jocasta's demonstration that wealth ὄνομ' ἔχει μόνον. M. may be right that these lines supplement 552-4 and are by the same hand. It is also possible, as I suggested earlier, that one set of commonplaces about money has attracted another. Both seem to me to smack of a later age.

As regards the second part, 559-67, D. has made two deletions, 563-5 (del. Willink) and 567 (del. Valckenaer). Willink cites a scholium to show that 563-5 were unknown to the scholiast and hence secondary. Valckenaer's deletion rests on no such external evidence but on the 'frigidity' of φιλότιμος δὲ σύ. These two deletions address two of the problems I noted, *art. cit.*, pp. 44-5, the irrelevant pathos of the captive maidens and the lameness of the concluding couplet, which I translated 'So then the wealth which you seek to possess with be painful [ὀδυνηρός] to Thebes, and you are an ambitious man'. The papyrus reading δαπανηρός (also a γρ. variant) sharpens the couplet somewhat, though at the cost of a word absent from serious poetry.

It is likely that 563-5 are secondary to the original passage, and I am inclined to include 562 with them. By contrast, it seems to me that 566-7 stand or fall together and that Valckenaer's deletion of a single line has no inherent probability. Those two lines were written as the concluding couplet by the same man who wrote 559-61. Any faults they have must count against the genuineness of the whole passage.

More telling than the individual details is the maladroitness of the whole. Let us adopt both of D.'s deletions for the sake of argument and transcribe the result:

ἄγ', ἢν σ' ἔρωμαι δύο λόγω προθεῖσ' ἅμα,
πότερα τυραννεῖν ἢ πόλιν σῶσαι θέλεις,
ἐρεῖς τυραννεῖν; ἢν δὲ νικήσῃ σ' ὅδε
'Αργεῖά τ' ἔγχη δόρυ τὸ Καδμείων ἕλῃ; 562
δαπανηρὸς ἆρ' ὁ πλοῦτος, ὃν ζητεῖς ἔχειν. 566

The first question is the natural opening to an argument that could be, but is not, made: 'If I ask you whether you wish to be king or to save the city, will you answer '"Be king"?' All that remains thereafter is to draw out the absurdity of the answer, which implies that one can be king over a city that has been destroyed: cf. S. *Ant.* 737-9, *OT* 54-7. But instead of this brief demonstration 'Jocasta' treats this answer as non-absurd and merely asks if his answer would be the same if Polynices and the Argives defeat the Thebans. From this the conclusion emerges, not that being king over a destroyed city is absurd but that 'the wealth you are seeking is costly'. An argument this badly constructed does not seem to me to be by Euripides.

586-7

ὦ θεοί, γένοισθε τῶνδ' ἀπότροποι κακῶν
καὶ ξύμβασίν τιν' Οἰδίπου τέκνοις δότε.

In 586 τῶνδ' ἀπότ'ροποι κακῶν is a disagreeable surprise for the ear: lengthening before unvoiced stop plus rho. Lengthening in initial position is rare in tragedy (see Barrett on *Hip.* 760 with addendum), and it is so rare in trimeters that the simple corrections necessary to eliminate them in *Alc.* 542 and *El.* 1058 and elsewhere should almost certainly be adopted. Lengthening in quasi-initial position, i.e. of a prepositional prefix, an augment, or a reduplication before a verb stem, is highly unusual in non-lyric meters. M. is able to cite one example from Aeschylus (*Pe.* 217), one from [Aeschylus] (*PV* 24), two from Sophocles (*El.* 1193, where προτρέπει is usually emended, and *OT* 640, daggered by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson), and five from Euripides (*IT* 51, *Tro.* 995, *Hel.* 404, *Pho.* 60, and the present passage). None of these involve the combination τρ. According to the list given by T. G. Tucker, *CR* 11 (1897), 343, the only other words in Euripides where τρ makes position between a compounding ele-

ment and a verbal stem are γηροτρόφος (*Alc.* 668) and ἐπιτρέπω, which Tucker lists with a question-mark and which I have not been able to find. The chances that something is amiss here seem fairly high.

The line offended Blaydes's ear as well, and he proposed τῶνδέ ⟨γ'⟩ ἀπότροποι κακῶν. This improves the prosody but at the cost of an unattractive particle. I suggest παράτροποι, a Euripidean word: see *Andr.* 527, where it is likewise construed with a genitive.

748-83

Ετ. ἔσται τάδ'· ἐλθὼν ἑπτάπυργον ἐς †πόλιν†
τάξω λοχαγοὺς πρὸς πύλαισιν, ὡς λέγεις,
ἴσους ἴσοισι πολεμίοισιν ἀντιθείς.
ὄνομα δ' ἑκάστου διατριβὴ πολλὴ λέγειν,
ἐχθρῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῖς τείχεσιν καθημένων.
ἀλλ' εἶμ', ὅπως ἂν μὴ καταργῶμεν χέρα.
[καί μοι γένοιτ' ἀδελφὸν ἀντήρη λαβεῖν
καὶ ξυσταθέντα διὰ μάχης ἑλεῖν δορὶ
κτανεῖν θ', ὃς ἦλθε πατρίδα πορθήσων ἐμήν.
γάμους δ' ἀδελφῆς Ἀντιγόνης παιδός τε σοῦ
Αἵμονος, ἐάν τι τῆς τύχης ἐγὼ σφαλῶ,
σοὶ χρὴ μέλεσθαι· τὴν δόσιν δ' ἐχέγγυον
τὴν πρόσθε ποιῶ νῦν ἐπ' ἐξόδοις ἐμαῖς.
μητρὸς δ' ἀδελφὸς εἶ· τί δεῖ μακρηγορεῖν;
τρέφ' ἀξίως νιν σοῦ τε τήν τ' ἐμὴν χάριν.
πατὴρ δ' ἐς αὑτὸν ἀμαθίαν ὀφλισκάνει,
ὄψιν τυφλώσας· οὐκ ἄγαν σφ' ἐπῄνεσα·
ἡμᾶς δ' ἀραῖσιν, ἢν τύχῃ, κατακτενεῖ.]
ἓν δ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἀργόν, εἴ τι θέσφατον
οἰωνόμαντις Τειρεσίας ἔχει φράσαι,
τοῦδ' ἐκπυθέσθαι ταῦτ'· ἐγὼ δὲ παῖδα σὸν
Μενοικέα, σοῦ πατρὸς αὐτεπώνυμον,
λαβόντα πέμψω δεῦρο Τειρεσίαν, Κρέον·
σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἡδὺς ἐς λόγους ἀφίξεται,
ἐγὼ δὲ τέχνην μαντικὴν ἐμεμψάμην
ἤδη πρὸς αὐτόν, ὥστε μοι μομφὰς ἔχειν.
[πόλει δὲ καὶ σοὶ ταῦτ' ἐπισκήπτω, Κρέον·

ἥνπερ κρατήσῃ τἀμά, Πολυνείκους νέκυν
μήποτε ταφῆναι τῇδε Θηβαίᾳ χθονί,
θνῄσκειν δὲ τὸν θάψαντα, κἂν φίλων τις ᾖ.
σοὶ μὲν τάδ' εἶπον· προσπόλοις δ' ἐμοῖς λέγω·]
ἐκφέρετε τεύχη πάνοπλά τ' ἀμφιβλήματα
ὡς εἰς ἀγῶνα τὸν προκείμενον δορός
[ὁρμώμεθ' ἤδη ξὺν δίκῃ νικηφόρῳ].
τῇ δ' Εὐλαβείᾳ, χρησιμωτάτῃ θεῶν,
προσευχόμεσθα τήνδε διασῶσαι πόλιν.

748 ἐς κύκλον Musgrave, ἐς στόμα Jackson cl. S. Ant. 119, ἔξοδον Wecklein cl. A. ScT 284 754-65 (una cum 753) del. dos Santos Alves (iam 756 del. Valckenaer cl. 1376, 753-6 del. Paley, 763-5 quos suspectos habuit Paley del. Helmbold, Fraenkel, 759b-767a del. Schumacher): vide Willink, PCPS 36 (1990) 182-201 770 ἄξοντα Markland, Valckenaer 774-7 del. Walter 778 om. Π^{10}, iam del. Kirchhoff 781 om. Π^{10}, del. Haslam

D. has deleted much of this speech, mostly with good reason. As Willink points out, the wish (754-6) to meet his brother and kill him with his own hand, although voiced in 621-2, is not germane to this scene of careful planning for the city and would surely have evoked some protest from Creon, as it did earlier from Jocasta. Likewise the command that Polynices' body be left unburied (775-7) not only assumes that he himself will perish at the same time but fails to make that assumption explicit. Equally prescient and equally inept is the allusion to Polynices' burial by 'one of his kin'. We can confidently delete 775-7 and almost as confidently a line on either side. Likewise the absence from a papyrus of 781 condemns it as an addition made to clarify an elliptical expression.

By contrast, it is perfectly proper for Eteocles setting forth for battle to make arrangements, as her κύριος, for the marriage of his sister Antigone 'in case I suffer some fall of fate'. Eteocles had earlier alluded to private matters he wanted to discuss with Creon (692). This earlier passage, blameless in itself, was deleted by D. on the suggestion of Willink, with some loss to the staging. After all, why should Eteocles stand around during the stasimon? Better to send him indoors and have him emerge talking to one of his retinue, a procedure paralleled at *Su.* 383-94. So we need not delete 757-60, and

these will be the private matter Eteocles wanted to discuss. By contrast I am happy to dispense with 761-5: 761-2 are utterly vacuous, and the discussion of Oedipus' folly in blinding himself and cursing his sons does not fit the topic under discussion. It may be that along with 754-65 we should delete 753, as originally proposed by dos Santos Alves.

1335-7

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ Β
ὦ τάλας ἐγώ, τίν' εἴπω μῦθον ἢ τίνας γόους;
Κρ. οἰχόμεσθ'· οὐκ εὐπροσώποις φροιμίοις ἄρχῃ λόγου.
Αγ. ὦ τάλας, δισσῶς ἀυτῶ· μεγάλα γὰρ φέρω κακά.

Between 1307 and 1353 D. deletes everything except these three lines. But why not finish the job? No other Euripidean messenger speaks tetrameters. δισσῶς is very odd in itself (why an adverb, except for metrical compulsion?) and without parallel in tragedy. The whole scene has been revised for a subsequent production that increased the part of Creon, and the new material has caused the loss of some genuine lines.

1604-7

οὐ σῳζόμεσθα· Ταρτάρου γὰρ ὤφελεν
ἐλθεῖν Κιθαιρὼν εἰς ἄβυσσα χάσματα,
ὅς μ' οὐ διώλεσ' ἀλλὰ δουλεῦσαί †τέ μοι†
δαίμων ἔδωκε Πόλυβον ἀμφὶ δεσπότην.

1606 τέ μοι] τ' ἐμοὶ Z; τέ με OA; γέ μοι Klotz δουλεύσοντά με Porson

M. well discusses the difficulties of 1606-7. The syntax can be fixed by comparatively minor changes, suggested in D.'s apparatus, but the biggest and least tractable problem, the idea that Oedipus' fate has been that of a slave to Polybus, an idea contradicted by the evidence of the prologue, cannot. Murray marked a lacuna immediately after ἀλλὰ but failed to provide a supplement. I cannot see,

however, that supplementation at that point can fix the problem. Stahl proposed δουλεύσας γ' ἐμοὶ / αἰῶν' ἔδωκε Πόλυβον ἀμφὶ δεσπότην, but this too leaves us with a Polybus who is Oedipus' master (since he cannot, surely, be Cithaeron's).

D. brackets the whole of the exodos, from 1582 to the end of the play. There are good reasons for his suspicions, and perhaps labor expended on this part of the play is labor wasted. But the interpolator in other respects writes very respectable Greek, betraying his hand only occasionally. It may be that Oedipus as slave to Polybus is this man's not very happy thought, but if we mark a lacuna in the right place, we may be giving him simple justice, and at trifling cost:

ὅς μ' οὐ διώλεσ' ἀλλὰ δουλεῦσαι ⟨τύχῃ
αἰσχρᾷ προσῆγεν· οἰκέτης πλαστὸν πατρὶ
υἱόν μ' ἔθηκε καὶ νόθον ψευδῆ⟩ τέ μοι
αἰῶν' ἔδωκε Πόλυβον ἀμφὶ δεσπότην.

Now Laius is called δεσπότης not as Oedipus' master but as master of the slave who rescued him.

1650-6

Κρ. τί δ'; οὐ δικαίως ὅδε κυσὶν δοθήσεται;
Αν. οὐκ ἔννομον γὰρ τὴν δίκην πράσσεσθέ νιν.
Κρ. εἴπερ γε πόλεως ἐχθρὸς ἦν οὐκ ἐχθρὸς ὤν.
Αν. οὔκουν ἔδωκε τῇ τύχῃ τὸν δαίμονα;
Κρ. καὶ τῷ τάφῳ νυν τὴν δίκην παρασχέτω.
Αν. τί πλημμελήσας, τὸ μέρος εἰ μετῆλθε γῆς;
Κρ. ἄταφος ὅδ' ἀνήρ, ὡς μάθῃς, γενήσεται.

1654-5 iam del. Nauck

In 1653 D. does not dagger τῇ τύχῃ τὸν δαίμονα, as Mastronarde does, apparently because he considers the whole passage spurious and not worth the trouble of obelizing. I agree with him that this whole scene is post-Euripidean, but it is competently written, and we should perhaps not acquiesce in something that seems impossible.

1758-63

ὦ πάτρας κλεινῆς πολῖται, λεύσσετ'· Οἰδίπους ὅδε,
ὃς τὰ κλείν' αἰνίγματ' ἔγνων καὶ μέγιστος ἦν ἀνήρ,
ὃς μόνος Σφιγγὸς κατέσχον τῆς μιαιφόνου κράτη,
νῦν ἄτιμος αὐτὸς οἰκτρὸς ἐξελαύνομαι χθονός.
ἀλλὰ γὰρ τί ταῦτα θρηνῶ καὶ μάτην ὀδύρομαι;
τὰς γὰρ ἐκ θεῶν ἀνάγκας θνητὸν ὄντα δεῖ φέρειν.

Here too we can do justice to the anonymous author of these lines if we write οἰκτρῶς in 1761: we don't want two adjectives flanking αὐτὸς, and the adverb οἰκτρῶς goes well with the verb.

ORESTES[1]

1-3

Οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν δεινὸν ὧδ' εἰπεῖν ἔπος
οὐδὲ πάθος οὐδὲ ξυμφορὰ θεήλατος,
ἧς οὐκ ἂν ἄραιτ' ἄχθος ἀνθρώπου φύσις.

2 -φορὰ θεήλατος ΩXZT^{z}gV et M^{2}B^{c}V^{1s} et $^{\gamma\rho}$Σ^{mvc} et (Luc.), Orio, Stob. cod. S, Suda, et interpr. Cic. Tusc. 4.63: -φορὰν θεήλατον M<B>VC et O$^{1\gamma\rho}$ et (Dio), Stob. codd. MA

A scholiast on this passage claims that the reading ξυμφορὰν θεήλατον is the original and that those who write the nominative do so ἀγνοοῦντες, not realizing that one should supply οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν as the governing verb in line 2. This sounds like the considered opinion of some Alexandrian scholar, and it should perhaps not be brushed lightly aside, even though the result seems counter-intuitive. In fact, however, when we consider carefully the two alternative readings with their different constructions, it is apparent that there are problems with both. I shall propose a third way of construing.

The two readings present us with two choices: either (1) take οὐδὲν ἔπος as nominative, modified by ὧδε δεινὸν εἰπεῖν (the infinitive being epexegetic) and followed by two other nominatives (πάθος, ξυμφορά), translating 'There is no word so dreadful to utter, no suffering, no god-sent disaster, whose burden human nature might not have to shoulder'; or (2) take οὐδὲν ἔπος as the accusative object of οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν followed by two other accusatives (πάθος, ξυμφοράν), translating 'It is impossible to name any word so terrible, any god-sent disaster, etc.'. (1) is the majority reading of the manuscripts and lies behind Cicero's translation at *Tusc. Disp.* 4.63,[2] while (2) comes with the recommendation of the scholiast.

---

[1] Throughout this chapter Willink and West indicate the commentaries of C. W. Willink (1986, rpt. Oxford, 1989 with additions) and M. L. West (Warminster, 1987). I also refer to N. Wedd, *Euripides: the Orestes* (Cambridge, 1942).

[2] 'Neque tam terribilis ulla fando oratio est, / nec sors, nec ira caelitum invectum malum, / quod non natura humana patiendo ecferat.'

(1) accords, as Willink says, with the Euripidean mannerism of writing οὐκ ἔστιν (. . .) οὐδέν followed by a nominative adjective, as at *Andr*. 986, *Hec*. 805, 956, *Sup*. 270, *El*. 367, *Hel*. 1618, *Or*. 1155, and fr. 358 (parallel in its turn to οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδείς at *El*. 903 and 1175). There is no instance of οὐκ ἔστιν (. . .) οὐδέν in Euripides where οὐδέν is an accusative object. Together these make (1) much more likely than (2). On the other side is the principle *utrum in alterum abiturum erat*. If the accusative is the true reading, the rise of the nominative is easy to explain, but the reverse corruption is less plausible. My own *Stilgefühl*, like that of most editors, rebels against taking οὐδὲν ἔπος as accusative, and if forced to make a choice between (1) and (2) I would choose (1). That leaves the corruption unexplained, but one might take refuge in the fact (for it is a fact) that not all corruptions can be neatly accounted for.

There is a further problem, though, common to both readings in the meaning of ἔπος. Willink says it is 'at once "word, utterance" and "thing denoted by utterance"', and he cites A. *Pers*. 173-4, εὖ τόδ' ἴσθι, γῆς ἄνασσα τῆσδε, μή σε δὶς φράσειν / μήτ' ἔπος μήτ' ἔργον ὧν ἂν δύναμις ἡγεῖσθαι θέλῃ. The end of the quotation is rather obscure, as Page notes in his apparatus, but the first part is clear enough, and there ἔπος has its usual sense 'word' (it is contrasted with ἔργον): 'Be well assured of this, my country's Queen, not twice hast thou to point out either word or deed, etc.' (H. W. Smyth). Similarly, Wedd says that ἔπος 'denotes the general class of which πάθος and συμφορά are the component members', and he translates 'there exists nothing so terrible to tell of', citing S. *OT* 1143, πρὸς τί τοῦτο τοὔπος ἱστορεῖς, a passage which also fails to lend much credibility to ἔπος, 'thing talked about': Lloyd-Jones translates 'Why are you asking this question?' I note that LSJ does not recognize this meaning. Cicero translates it *oratio*.

If ἔπος means 'word, utterance', the passage must be translated 'There is no word so terrible to utter, no suffering or god-sent disaster, whose burden man being what he is might not take up'. One could explicate 'word so terrible to utter' as a reference to Tantalus' sins of tongue or even to the oracle of Apollo. Still, in such a general statement about what human nature might take on, words, no matter how terrible, are not what we expect, and ἔπος, explicated or followed by πάθος and ξυμφορά, is in strange company. Nor is Wedd's

idea that ἔπος is the genus and πάθος and ξυμφορά the species at all attractive.[1] It is not mere captiousness to be dissatisfied here.

According to the A scholiast, the genus of which πάθος and συμφορά are the species is not ἔπος but δεινόν:

> οὐκ ἔστιν ⟨οὐδὲν⟩ δεινόν· τὸ δεινὸν ὄνομα γενικόν ἐστι, διαιρεῖται δὲ εἰς πάθος καὶ συμφοράν.

The A and B scholia have the following a little further down:

> ἄλλως: ὧδ' εἰπεῖν ἔπος: ἤγουν ὡς ἐν συντόμῳ λόγῳ εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἔστι τι δεινόν, οὔτε πάθος οὔτε συμφορά, ἧς οὐκ ἂν τὸ βάρος ἡ τῶν βροτῶν φύσις ὑπενέγκοιτο.

In other words ὧδ' εἰπεῖν ἔπος is a limitative infinitive (sometimes called infinitive absolute) whose function, like that of ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν in prose, is to indicate that the speaker knows that his generalization is only *practically* valid, that it might have (immaterial) exceptions.[2] On this showing we should translate, 'There is virtually nothing terrible, no suffering or god-sent disaster, whose burden man, being what he is, might not shoulder'. This is considerably less awkward than our last effort at translation, and it does not require labored explanation. The sentence thus translated strikes me as being exactly what is required.[3]

If it is what is required, two things remain to be explained, the variant ξυμφορὰν θεήλατον, which we already noted as puzzling, and Cicero's labored translation of the majority text. One way of explaining these anomalies is to suppose that Euripides wrote ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος (Blaydes), that this was corrupted very early to ὧδ' εἰπεῖν ἔπος, and that this obscured the true construction of the infinitive, causing

---

[1] A further difficulty is the position of ὧδε following the adjective, on which see my comment on *Ba.* 1036-7 below.

[2] This possibility is noted by Wedd. This interpretation was argued for in the sixteenth century by Marc-Antoine Muret, *Variarum Lectionum Libri XV* (Venice, 1559 et seq.), VIII 16, more easily accessible in *M. Antoni Mureti Opera Omnia*, ed. C. H. Frotscher (Leipzig, 1843), 3.180-1.

[3] If someone should object that ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος is an unnecessary and unwanted qualifier, consider A. *Pers.* 714, where διαπεπόρθηται τὰ Περσῶν πράγματα scarcely *needs* ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος, yet it is not—to Greek taste, apparently—unwanted. The same could be said of *Hcld.* 167.

Cicero to translate awkwardly and others to alter ξυμφορὰ θεήλατος consciously or unconsciously into the accusative. Although ὧδ' εἰπεῖν ἔπος is theoretically a possible limitative infinitive (see the examples with ὧδε and οὕτως in Goodwin, *Syntax* § 776-83), it differs from the standard phrase (see A. *Pers.* 714, E. *Hcld.* 167, and *Hip.* 1162), which may have hindered recognition. There is a bare possibility that the scholiast had ὡς in his text. Though the corruption ΩCEI to ΩΔΕΙ seems unlikely at first, the words immediately preceding the *omega* starts with *delta*, as does the syllable before that, and this might have played a role. Alternatively, we could keep transmitted ὧδ', translate the phrase as a limitative infinitive, and suppose that Cicero and at least one Greek simply didn't understand the construction. In the Loeb I place a comma after δεινόν and keep ὧδ' in the text, but I regard the case for ὡς as strong.

11-14

> οὗτος φυτεύει Πέλοπα, τοῦ δ' Ἀτρεὺς ἔφυ,
> ᾧ στέμματα ξήνασ' ἐπέκλωσεν θεὰ
> Ἔρις Θυέστῃ πόλεμον ὄντι συγγόνῳ
> θέσθαι· τί τἄρρητ' ἀναμετρήσασθαί με δεῖ;

13 ἔρις FGPr et $V^{1/2s}$ et γρΣ^{mbvc}: ἔριν ΩXZT^{z} et $F^{2}Pr^{1s}$ et Σ Procl. in Hes. Op. 191 (p. 145 Vollbehr): [Ry] πόλεμόν τ' ZT^{z} (~T^{t3}) et $V^{1/2c}$ (cf. Σ^{mbvc} πόλεμον καὶ ἔριν); [Ry]

Shall we read Ἔρις in 13 with a minority of the mss. or ἔριν with the majority? The former yields 'to whom the goddess Eris, carding out her tufts of wool, spun the destiny that he should make war on his brother Thyestes', the latter 'to whom the Goddess (i.e. Moira or Clotho), carding out her tufts of wool, spun a destiny of strife, that he should make war on his brother Thyestes'. Willink argues confidently for the former, which D. adopts, but I think there is much to be said for the latter.

First, corruption of accusative to nominative is easy to explain, the reverse corruption more difficult. The presence of two accusatives (ἔριν, πόλεμον) has clearly given rise in one part of the tradition to the unmetrical πόλεμόν τ', and Ἔρις is very likely a

conscious or unconscious conjecture, intended to meet the same difficulty, by a reader who failed to see that ἔριν and πόλεμον go with different verbs.

Second, the minority reading makes less convincing sense of two elements in 12, στέμματα ξήνασ' and ἐπέκλωσεν. It is not plausible so emphatically to put the apparatus of thread-spinning into the hands of the goddess Strife. By contrast, the two expressions make good sense as a way of identifying the goddess as either Moira or Klotho. And when we examine the usage of ἐπικλώθω, we find that the only subjects it has are Moira(i) and 'the gods', never any particular divinity other than the Moirai. If a parallel is sought for this use of θεά to mean one of the Fates, I cite the first line of the *Iliad*, where the θεά is identified as one of the Muses only by the verb of which she is the subject. Willink notes that Euripides has once θεὰ / Ἄρτεμις (*IT* 35-6), but that does not prove that he wrote θεὰ / Ἔρις here. He defends the minority reading by discussing the strife theme in the play, but the majority reading also contributes to this theme even without a personified Eris.

67-8

βλέπω δὲ πᾶσαν εἰς ὁδόν, πότ' ὄψομαι
Μενέλαον ἥκονθ'· ὡς κτλ.

67 εἰς ὁδόν Musgrave: εἴσοδον codd.: ἐς ὁδόν, ⟨εἴ⟩ ποτ' Markland

I can remember encountering these lines for the first time more than thirty years ago in Murray's edition, feeling that something was wrong, but being unable to fix it. I am not sure that the suggestion I make below is the truth, but it may be worthwhile to set out my misgivings, which, to judge from his apparatus, are shared in some measure by D. and perhaps by Willink as well. (1) The indirect question πότ' ὄψομαι is somewhat loosely connected to the rest of the sentence. The interrogative is also a bit surprising: 'I look . . . (to see) *when* I shall behold Menelaus etc.' Markland's conjecture is probably intended to replace the indirect question with an εἰ-clause of the sort to be translated 'if haply, on the chance that'. This is welcome, but I note that I can find no example of such a construction with the

future indicative: the usual construction in primary sequence employs ἐάν plus the subjunctive (see K.-G. ii.534, A. 16).

There is other trouble elsewhere. (2) On 'every road' West writes, 'It would have been sufficient to watch the road from Nauplia, but "every road" gives a greater sense of anticipation'. I don't find this plausible. When Medea is waiting for news of the princess's death (*Med.* 1116-7) she looks down a single εἴσοδος (note the deictic τἀκεῖθεν), and I cannot see that anticipation would have been increased if she had turned her head now left, now right. 'Every' is in any case odd since only two are in question. (3) Lastly, βλέπω εἰς is elsewhere used of persons to whom you look (for help, etc.) or of things that are an object of intrinsic interest (e.g. *Pho.* 1364, ἐς Ἄργος), and the translation 'look toward' seems to fit most cases.[1] By contrast it is inept here: 'I look toward every road' is an odd way to say 'I am watching every road'.

There seems to be enough doubt here to justify writing 67 with daggers thus: βλέπω †δὲ πᾶσαν εἴσοδον† πότ' ὄψομαι. The sense would be improved if we could find some word like 'in suspense' for the indirect question to depend on or a proper direction for her gaze. We get the first if we write βλέπω δ' ἐπαρθεῖσ' followed by a comma. We get the second with βλέπω δ' ἐπ' ἀκτάς (cf. 55, which mentions Menelaus being moored 'at the headlands'). The rest then can be taken together as '(eager to learn) when I shall see Menelaus arrived in the road': cf. the similar locution at 1311-2, ᾐσθόμην τινὸς / κέλευθον ἐσπεσόντος ἀμφὶ δώματα. We also cannot ignore the possibility of accidental interpolation of explanatory glosses: transmitted εἴσοδον belongs to the vocabulary of scholiastic comment, and it could be that the word is an accidental intrusion that has obliterated a word or words that in no way resembled it.

[1] βλέπω and its compounds are used with εἰς or πρός in the sense 'look to or toward' (a person for help, in pity, in anger, for orders, etc.) at *Alc.* 390, *Med.* 247, 1076, *Hcld.* 225, *Andr.* 179, 246, 762, *Su.* 8, 177, *HF* 81, 435, *IT* 928, 1056, *Ion* 614, *IA* 320, 1238, 1378, fr. 402.6; in the sense 'look at or into' (a person's face, the enemy's spear, etc.) at *Hip.* 280, 416, *Su.* 318, *El.* 377, 567, *HF* 1227, *Ion* 732, *Rhes.* 114, fr. 81(?), *Cretes*, fr. 11.11-2 (Page, *GLP* 74); in the sense 'look toward' (a near or distant object) at *Alc.* 206, *Hip.* 1206, *Pho.* 458, 1364, 1373, *IA* 1577; in the sense 'have regard for, turn one's attention toward' at *Alc.* 1122, *Hcld.* 159, *Andr.* 404, *Hec.* 585, *Su.* 212, 422, *Hel.* 267, 1442, *IA* 1411, fr. 216, 332.3. The closest parallel is perhaps *Hel.* 1558, where the phrase ἐς κέρας παρεμβλέπων is used of a bull looking towards something but at another object. The specialized nature of this usage means that it does little to quiet suspicion concerning *Or.* 67.

Since I have mentioned the Nauplia eisodos this is perhaps the best occasion to discuss the whole question of the use of the eisodoi in this play. Willink (pp. xl-xlii) says that both are 'equally available for access to/from the surrounding city' and that '*a fortiori*, both are available for an expected arrival from the port of Nauplia, 67-8'.[1] This runs counter to the view of Taplin, *Stagecraft*, pp. 450-1, that the two eisodoi normally represent two different destinations. (Often, but not always, each has its own emotional coloring—in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*, for example, the dangers of the sea and the cousins on one side and the safety of the city of Argos on the other.) We should ask what evidence exists that Euripides violated the ordinary practice of assigning each offstage destination to a single eisodos[2] and whether this evidence is capable of a different interpretation.

The idea that Electra is expecting Menelaus to come down either of the two ramps and that Nauplia lies in either direction is inherently implausible. *Prima facie* 67-8 imply that Menelaus might use either ramp, but enough suspicion attaches to these lines to make this a slender reed. How about the exit to the Argive assembly? Willink says that Tyndareus and Menelaus on their way there make their exit in one direction (toward Clytaemestra's tomb) and Orestes and Pylades in the other (toward Agamemnon's tomb). This gives an opposition of maternal and paternal, faithless and faithful.

It should be noted that the opposition is normally one of destinations, not of the character of the people who take them, so that Willink's view derives no support from the views of Taplin that he cites in its defense.[3] To test Willink's hypothesis let us see if it is possible to construct a non-contradictory 'topography' for this play in which for each destination there is only one eisodos (naturally a single eisodos may represent more than one destination). If we find one, this won't prove that this plan was the one actually adopted by Euripides

---

[1] The same view is taken by S. Saïd, 'Tragic Argos', in *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*, edd. A. Sommerstein et al. (Bari, 1993), pp. 167-89 and, with some modification, by E. Medda, 'La casa e la città: spazio scenico e spazio drammatico nell'*Oreste* de Euripide', *SIFC* 17 (1999), 12-65 (here 36-56).

[2] The same fluidity in the use of entrances is proposed for *Ba.* by R. Seaford, ed.. and tr., *Euripides: Bacchae* (Warminster, 1996), pp. 148-9. I discuss eisodos assignments in my note on *Ba.* 346-54.

[3] Also, as Medda points out (p. 40), the mention of Agamemnon's tomb comes too late in the play for the audience to use it as a marker for the important exits during the second episode.

for the play's first production, but general considerations of tragic and Euripidean practice elsewhere would incline the balance in its favor.

Since we usually have no way of knowing whether a given destination was represented by the right or the left eisodos,[1] I will designate them neutrally (in conformity with my practice in the Loeb Euripides) as Eisodos A and Eisodos B, calling the ramp used first in the play A and the other one B. Thus Eisodos A is established as leading to the grave of Clytaemestra, down which Hermione is sent. This is the ramp on which Tyndareus arrives (see 471-3). It is a not unreasonable assumption that this is the same ramp on which Menelaus arrives from Nauplia.[2] It is thus, in general, the ramp to be used for arrivals from foreign parts, and the one exception to this rule (Pylades' entrance) is explicitly marked in the text.

Eisodos B lies in the direction of the agora, where the Argive assembly takes place. Since the chorus are Argive women, it is reasonable to have them arriving by the 'domestic', not the 'foreign' ramp. When Tyndareus departs for the assembly, we must suppose that he does so by Eisodos B. (The more difficult case of Menelaus is discussed below in the note on 696-716.) We might expect Pylades to come in by Eisodos A, like other arrivals from abroad, but his first lines (729-31) indicate that he has passed 'through the city', i.e. past the civic center of agora and dicastery, not therefore approaching the palace by the expected route.[3] (He, of course, comes from the north unlike Tyndareus and Menelaus, though that may be irrelevant: it is

---

[1] Willink, p. xlii, makes an interesting argument for left and right in the case of *Orestes*, but everything depends on assigning 1311-2 to the same hemichorus that sang 1258-9. This is hard to prove. Naturally most plays do not provide even this much evidence. The attempt by David Wiles, *Tragedy in Athens: Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning* (Cambridge, 1997), to fill this gap in our knowledge is promising,, but often the evidence points in opposite directions.

[2] West's argument that Menelaus and Tyndareus use different eisodoi is discussed below, p. 80, n. 1.

[3] We are not meant, of course, to think of the palace as being on the edge of town, with no habitations in the direction of Eisodos A: when Menelaus sent Helen from Nauplia at night, he did so to avoid her meeting angry citizens along the way, and it is a consideration when Helen thinks of sending Hermione to Clytaemestra's tomb that she will expose herself to the gaze of the citizens. That being said, however, we need only one eisodos to lead to the hill where the citizens assemble, and only one to Nauplia and Clytaemestra's tomb. Similarly, in *Pho.* Polynices, entering by the 'from abroad' ramp, passes some of his old haunts in the city, but that is no argument against assigning one ramp to foreign and the other to domestic arrivals.

enough that he specifies that he came into town by the road that took him from the agora to the palace.) When Orestes and Pylades leave to go to the assembly, they naturally use Eisodos B like Tyndareus before them. This, we learn in 796-7, takes them by the tomb of Agamemnon. Since we learned earlier that the tomb of Clytaemestra is reached by the other eisodos, we might wonder why Orestes' parents are not buried in the same part of town, but the text supplies no explanation. (Incidentally, we cannot infer from 798, as Willink does, that they are not: that line is compatible with their being on the same road; rather it follows from our assumption, made above, that both Menelaus and Tyndareus use the same eisodos, the one for visitors from abroad. The contrary assumption, that Clytaemestra's grave is a destination for Eisodos B, would mean that Eisodos A is used only for the entrance of Menelaus from Nauplia, not impossible but uncharacteristic of Euripides.)

Here then is an arrangment in which each off-stage destination is represented by only one eisodos.[1] The emotional coloring of the two ramps is as clear and univocal as one normally finds. Eisodos A is marked early on as the source of salvation since Menelaus as savior is expected from that quarter. (It is true that Tyndareus, dreaded as a scourge, also uses this ramp, but since many sorts of things can come 'from abroad', whether as threat or rescue, e.g. in *Andromache*, we need not demand more consistency than we have here.) Finally, in an ironic twist, it is used by Hermione, who represents salvation of a different kind: she is to be taken hostage. Down Eisodos B lies the source of trouble for Orestes and Electra, the trouble reported by Pylades and the Messenger and the trouble that Tyndareus goes to fo-

[1] West, pp. 37-8, though taking essentially the same view as I do, assigns Nauplia to one eisodos and the assembly, the tomb of Clytaemestra, and the tomb of Agamemnon to the other. He adduces 471ff. to show that Tyndareus, coming from his daughter's tomb, is making his way past the palace to the other, Nauplia, eisodos. This is a theoretically possible arrangement. But (1) Tyndareus' hearing of Menelaus' landing at Nauplia is more plausible if the tomb and the harbor lie in the same direction rather than at the other side of the compass. (2) If he comes down the Nauplia ramp to find Menelaus, the spectators will assume that he has reason to think—what is reasonable in itself—that Menelaus has not stayed at Nauplia but has made his way to the palace. (3) Tyndareus' entrance by Eisodos A and his departure by Eisodos B into the city makes a visual statement of the fact that the interview with Orestes has changed him from one who will not help, to one who actively harms, his grandson. (4) My arrangement has all the entrances from and exits to foreign parts—except the specially marked entrance of Pylades—occurring by the same eisodos and it employs the two less lopsidedly.

ment and Orestes and Pylades to endure.[1] Since we have produced a non-contradictory arrangement where each destination has a unique eisodos, the rhetorical question may be put: why would Euripides have made his stage geography more confusing than it had to be?

255-76: see 'Rationalism, Naive and Malign, in Euripides' *Orestes'*, in J. F. Miller, C. Damon, and K. S. Myers, edd., *Vertis in usum. Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney* (Leipzig, 2002), pp. 277-86.

360-74

Ἀγαμέμνονος μὲν γὰρ τύχας ἠπιστάμην
[καὶ θάνατον, οἵῳ πρὸς δάμαρτος ὤλετο],
Μαλέᾳ προσίσχων πρῷραν· ἐκ δὲ κυμάτων
ὁ ναυτίλοισι μάντις ἐξήγγειλέ μοι
Νηρέως προφήτης Γλαῦκος, ἀψευδὴς θεός,
ὅς μοι τόδ' εἶπεν ἐμφανῶς κατασταθείς·
Μενέλαε, κεῖται σὸς κασίγνητος θανών,
λουτροῖσιν ἀλόχου περιπεσὼν πανυστάτοις.
δακρύων δ' ἔπλησεν ἐμέ τε καὶ ναύτας ἐμοὺς
πολλῶν. ἐπεὶ δὲ Ναυπλίας ψαύω χθονός
[ἤδη δάμαρτος ἐνθάδ' ἐξορμωμένης],
δοκῶν Ὀρέστην παῖδα τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος
φίλαισι χερσὶ περιβαλεῖν καὶ μητέρα,
ὡς εὐτυχοῦντας, ἔκλυον ἁλιτύπων τινὸς
τῆς Τυνδαρείας παιδὸς ἀνόσιον φόνον.

361 del. Dindorf 367 del. West (qui etiam 365-6 suspectos habet) 370 del. Willink

Dindorf's deletion of 361 is justified both on stylistic grounds ('fate and death', as West says, make a feeble coupling) and because if we read 361 we can make no sense of 372-3. Menelaus must have

[1] No support for the idea that the same destination might be reached by either eisodos derives from the scene at 1251ff. where the Chorus split into two parts to watch both eisodoi. It is not that they are unclear which route Hermione will take, rather that they have been told (1217-21; cf. 1255-7, 1269-70, 1279) to watch out for any Argive who might interfere with the murder.

learned from Glaucus only that Agamemnon was dead, not 'how he perished at the hands of his wife'. Glaucus' words about meeting with a last bath at the hands of his wife must therefore be deliberately riddling, understood by Menelaus at the time as a reference to the bath a dead man receives from his female kin but understood in retrospect as a reference to Agamemnon's murder in the bath. The alternative would be to delete 365-7 or just 367 with West, but I see nothing in the lines to suggest an interpolator.

Yet consider what follows from this: Menelaus reached Nauplia thinking that he would be able to take both Clytaemestra and Orestes in his loving arms because he did not know that it was Clytaemestra who had killed Agamemnon. 'But when I reached Nauplia, thinking that I would take Orestes, Agamemnon's son, in my loving arms together with his mother, in the belief that they were faring well, I learned from a sailor'—and here, we feel, Menelaus must learn not only of Clytaemestra's death at the hands of Orestes but also the fact alluded to but not revealed by Glaucus' riddling words, that it was Clytaemestra who had killed Agamemnon. In other words, 374 is too brief to represent what Menelaus heard. Perhaps we should mark a lacuna, e.g.

ἔκλυον ἀλιτύπων τινὸς
τῆς Τυνδαρείας παιδὸς ⟨ἀνδροκμῆθ' ὅπλον
οἰκτροῦ τ' Ὀρέστου μητρὸς⟩ ἀνόσιον φόνον.

In view, however, of the real unclarity about some aspects of the plot (see my Loeb introduction) we cannot rule out the possibility that the text is sound and the absence from Menelaus' account of the single most important fact mitigating his nephew's guilt is deliberate. For the suggestion that Menelaus may be guilty of more than cowardice, see the article cited above on *Or*. 255-76, pp. 284-5.

419-26

Με. κᾆτ' οὐκ ἀμύνει Λοξίας τοῖς σοῖς κακοῖς;
Ορ. μέλλει· τὸ θεῖον δ' ἐστὶ τοιοῦτον φύσει.
Με. πόσον χρόνον δὲ μητρὸς οἴχονται πνοαί;
Ορ. ἕκτον τόδ' ἦμαρ· ἔτι πυρὰ θερμὴ τάφου.

Με. ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἷμα μητέρος θεαί.
Ορ. †οὐ σοφός, ἀληθὴς δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυς κακός.†
Με. πατρὸς δὲ δὴ τί σ' ὠφελεῖ τιμωρία;
Ορ. οὔπω· τὸ μέλλον δ' ἴσον ἀπραξίᾳ λέγω.

423-5 textum lacunis laborare coni. Kirchhoff; 423-6 del. Günther (WS 102 [1989] 115-7) (425-6 sive 421-6 iam Harberton); 412-3 post 423 trai. Willink 424 ἀληθῶς Bothe (1800), denuo Paley ἔφυς κακός ΩZT^{z}gV et Σ^{v}: εἰπὼν κακῶς X (εἰπὼν etiam $T^{t2\gamma\rho}$), optimo sensu modo h.v. post 417 legatur: ἔφυν φίλος Brunck, ἔφυ θεός West

The problems in 423-4 have been noted before, and several quite different solutions have been proposed, some of them cited by D. in his apparatus. Murray adopted Brunck's ἔφυν φίλος and let it go at that, but Jackson *MS* 57-9 shows with devastating clarity how unlikely the postulated corruption is and how, for all its unlikeliness, it fails to address the chief difficulty: 'the verse is an irrelevance: no answer to the one foregoing, which it ignores; no prelude to the one following, by which it is ignored'. Relevance to the surrounding context is the most pressing requirement here. We will see that the best of the solutions proposed thus far try to meet this requirement. In my view none achieves complete success.

Jackson, like Kirchhoff before him, believes that the wording of 424 can only be explained if it is the first half of one verse and the second half of another. Kirchhoff had put a lacuna (a verse by Orestes) after 423 followed by a lacunose verse of Menelaus ending ἐς φίλους ἔφυς κακός and another lacunose verse of Orestes beginning οὐ σοφὸς ἀληθὴς δ'. Jackson points out that Kirchhoff neglected to offer any supplements, and he objects that he needlessly complicates matters by reversing the halves of 424. Jackson himself offers a simpler distribution of lacunae and provides supplements that he thinks might have led to the omissions:

Με. ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἷμα μητέρος θεαί.
Ορ. ⟨κἀγὼ μετῆλθον ἄλλο σὺν τάχει τινί.
Με⟩. οὐ σοφός, ἀληθὴς δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυς ⟨φίλος. 424a
Ορ. οὐ σοφὸν ἂν εἴποιμ' ὃς φίλοις ἔφυ⟩ κακός. 424b
Με. πατρὸς δὲ δὴ τί σ' ὠφελεῖ τιμωρία;

Jackson's supplements, as usual, are a bravura performance. But the problem of relevance is unsolved, and additionally the lines are not perfectly in character. In response to Orestes' admission that he had acted hastily, Menelaus (424a) is made to say that Orestes acted unwisely but was a true φίλος to his father. This is a more lenient view of Orestes' deed than Menelaus expresses elsewhere in the play. Then Orestes, in spite of this leniency, insists (424b) that no one who failed to do as he did would deserve to be called σοφός, no obvious position to take and not one Orestes takes elsewhere. The relevance of 425 to the foregoing discussion is not instantly obvious: 'But the point is (for δὲ δὴ see Denniston on *El.* 236), has avenging your father helped you at all?' This way of putting it, impatient particles and all, seems rather remote from the matter at hand. I have tried to think of other ways of filling in these particular lacunae that would avoid these objections but have not succeeded.

Willink proposes moving 412-3 to follow 423, making a small adjustment in the wording of 424:

Με. ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἷμα μητέρος θεαί. 423
Ορ. οἴμοι διωγμῶν, οἷς ἐλαύνομαι τάλας. 412
Με. οὐ δεινὰ πάσχειν δεινὰ τοὺς εἰργασμένους. 413
Ορ. οὐ σοφὸς ἀληθῶς ἐς φίλους ὁ φὺς κακός. 424
Με. πατρὸς δὲ δὴ τί σ' ὠφελεῖ τιμωρία; 425

Here again there are attractions. But in the face of Menelaus' assertion in 413 that there is nothing shocking when those who do shocking things suffer them, it is a bit odd to have Orestes say that if he had failed in loyalty to φίλοι, he would have forfeited the claim to be wise: why does Orestes raise a claim to σοφία here? I concede that 425 brightens a bit in its new context: 'But what good has this loyalty done you?'

West, *BICS* 28 (1981), 69, writes 424 as οὐ σοφός, ἀληθὴς δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυ θεός. He thinks that 'a reference to Apollo is indispensable', that this line was written to answer 417, and that the intervening 418-23 are a later expansion by Euripides. Like Willink I find this hypothesis unconvincing.

My own solution starts from the implications of 425-6, which return to the topic of 419-20. Orestes' 426 seems to be accusing someone of 'non-action', and that someone can only be Apollo. If so, it follows that the subject of ὠφελεῖ in 425 is implicitly Apollo: 'Men. Is your avenging of your father doing you any good at all? Or. Not yet: I consider delay to be the same as inaction.' Apollo is being subjected to criticism. It is likely that †ἀληθὴς δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυς κακός† also criticizes him. In order to get sense we have only to mark a lacuna of two lines after 423 (one lacuna being more economical than Jackson's two) in which Orestes will move from the Erinyes to Apollo, Menelaus will assert, so that Orestes may deny, that the god is σοφός, and one of them will make it clear why Orestes counts as one of his φίλοι:

Με. ὡς ταχὺ μετῆλθόν σ' αἷμα μητέρος θεαί. 423
⟨Ορ. ταχὺν πιθέσθαι γ'· ὁ δὲ θεὸς σῶσαι βραδύς. 423a
Με. σοφὸς δὲ μείνας ἐκτὸς αἰτίας θεός.⟩ 423b
Ορ. οὐ σοφὸς ἀληθῶς ἐς φίλους ὁ φὺς κακός. 424
Με. πατρὸς δὲ δὴ τί σ' ὠφελεῖ τιμωρία; 425
Ορ. οὔπω· τὸ μέλλον δ' ἴσον ἀπραξίᾳ λέγω.

By common consent 424 had to be altered unless it was to be split into two parts. Here the alterations are slight: ἀληθῶς for ἀληθὴς δ' (Bothe) and ὁ φὺς for ἔφυς (Willink).[1] The transitions of thought between 423 and 424 are natural and in character: Line 423a epigrammatically contrasts Orestes' readiness to obey Apollo with the god's slowness to help and establishes that Orestes has a claim on Apollo, not essentially different from that of a human φίλος. Menelaus, anticipating his own policy of selfish indifference, praises the god for his wisdom in staying clear of blame. Orestes objects that if that is what he is doing he does not deserve to be called σοφός. Finally, Menelaus wants to know (δὲ δὴ getting to the nub) whether Orestes' obedience has done him *any* good, and Orestes again complains of the god's tardiness.

[1] Willink's ἐς φίλους ὁ φὺς is slightly more economical than, e.g., ὃς φίλοις ἔφυ (Willink *per litteras*), which involves changing more words. See Willink ad loc. for a defense of ὁ φύς = ὅστις ἔφυ.

557-62

ἡ σὴ δὲ θυγάτηρ (μητέρ' αἰδοῦμαι λέγειν)
ἰδίοισιν ὑμεναίοισι κοὐχὶ σώφροσιν
ἐς ἀνδρὸς ᾔει λέκτρ'· ἐμαυτόν, ἢν λέγω
κακῶς ἐκείνην, ἐξερῶ· λέξω δ' ὅμως·
[Αἴγισθος ἦν ὁ κρυπτὸς ἐν δόμοις πόσις·]
τοῦτον κατέκτειν', ἐπὶ δ' ἔθυσα μητέρα, κτλ.

561 del. Reeve   ὁ] οἱ Nauck

Lines 559-60 seem to say 'If I speak ill of her, I speak myself out forthrightly, but yet I will speak'. 'Speak out forthrightly' (for that is the meaning of ἐξερῶ) is not what we want, and furthermore the main clause would benefit if the verb of speaking had a qualifier, parallel to κακῶς in the protasis, to give the meaning 'If I speak ill of her, I speak ill of myself, but nonetheless I will speak'. It is plain that ἐξ- is not wanted and that it takes the place of a word we need. I suggest αἴσχρ' ἐρῶ. For the double accusative with λέγω cf. *Pho.* 200-1, ἡδονὴ δέ τις γυναιξὶ μηδὲν ὑγιὲς ἀλλήλας λέγειν. For the corruption, cf. the frequent interchange of ἐχθρός with αἰσχρός, as at *Alc.* 1037.

In the first printing I adopted Nauck's οἱ in 561 instead of deleting the line with M. D. Reeve, *GRBS* 14 (1973), 156. I now think that Nauck is wrong and Reeve right. Only by adopting Nauck's conjecture can the line be saved, for Orestes' point is that Clytaemestra had a lover, and his identity makes no essential difference, whereas in 561 as transmitted the only information given is that Aegisthus was the lover in question. Yet there are no plausible instances in Euripides of the dative οἱ (οἷ), either reflexive or anaphoric: see my note on *El.* 924 and Denniston's comment *ad loc.* Further in favor of deletion is the fact that the line is flat. The motive for its insertion is obvious: λέξω δ' ὅμως seems to promise that Orestes *will* speak evil of Clytaemestra, and yet he does not do so until 573. In reality, 'If I speak ill of her, I speak ill of myself, but nonetheless I will speak' does not promise anything over and above what Orestes has already said but merely indicates his general determination to describe his mother's crimes, whatever may be the cost to himself.

564-71

ἐφ’ οἷς δ’ ἀπειλεῖς ὡς πετρωθῆναί με χρή,
ἄκουσον ὡς ἅπασαν Ἑλλάδ’ ὠφελῶ.
εἰ γὰρ γυναῖκες ἐς τόδ’ ἥξουσιν θράσους,
ἄνδρας φονεύειν, καταφυγὰς ποιούμεναι
ἐς τέκνα, μαστοῖς τὸν ἔλεον θηρώμεναι,
παρ’ οὐδὲν αὐταῖς ἦν ἂν ὀλλύναι πόσεις
ἐπίκλημ’ ἐχούσαις ὅ τι τύχοι. δράσας δ’ ἐγὼ
δείν’, ὡς σὺ κομπεῖς, τόνδ’ ἔπαυσα τὸν νόμον.

These lines of Orestes are suspicious. The rest of his argument is sober and restrained and makes arguments that are not inflammatory but rhetorically effective. By contrast 564-71 are hyperbolic, claiming that Orestes is the benefactor of all Hellas and that Greek men were in danger of being killed for trivial causes by their wives until he saved them. This argument is one that Orestes is going to make in the assembly after all other arguments have been made to no effect (934-7, expanded by interpolation in 938-42). The present passage not only steals the later passage's thunder but also interrupts the course of the surrounding argument, as can be seen from my summary below. It will be seen that I have rejected some of D.'s transpositions and deletions and accepted one transposition of my own.

A. Proem: my situation as matricide and my respect for your gray head impede my speech. But please allow me to proceed (544[-5], 546-50).

B. What should I have done? Set two facts against two others. The first facts are that my father begot me and my mother gave me nurture. The second are that my mother sinned grievously against my father by taking a lover (and in avenging my father for this I was forced to offend against piety) . . . (551-3[-6], 557-63).

[I am all Greece's benefactor since I put a stop to Clytaemestra's precedent, which would have meant husbands' being killed for trivial reasons by wives in the confidence they could win mercy from their sons (564-71).]

B'. . . . and by murdering him. I had good grounds both to hate and to kill my mother since she wronged her husband while he was

away in the service of his country and then killed him to escape punishment (572-8).

C. In the gods' name[1] think of what would have happened had I done nothing: my father's Erinyes would have pursued me (579-84 [588-90]).[2]

D. I also acted out of obedience to Apollo, and his responsibility frees me from pollution (591-9).[3]

E. Peroration: your daughter both deprived me of a father and made me a matricide; do not say that my deed was wrong, only that it brought the doer unhappiness (585-7, 600-1[-4]).

In addition to these larger and more general considerations there are some minor features of the passage that are suspicious. (1) In 570 ὅτι τύχοι, 'any whatsoever, any no matter how trivial', is an expression without close parallel in tragedy and only one distant one (see Willink ad loc.). (2) 571 claims that Tyndareus had called Orestes' deeds δεινά, but in fact he did not, the closest thing being 524. To show the effect of the deletions and transpositions I accept, I transcribe the whole speech as restored.

ὦ γέρον, ἐγώ τοι πρὸς σὲ δειμαίνω λέγειν·
ἐγῷδ', ἀνόσιός εἰμι μητέρα κτανών,
ὅσιος δέ γ' ἕτερον ὄνομα, τιμωρῶν πατρί.
ἀπελθέτω δὲ τοῖς λόγοισιν ἐκποδὼν
τὸ γῆρας ἡμῖν τὸ σόν, ὅ μ' ἐκπλήσσει λόγου,
καὶ καθ' ὁδὸν εἶμι· νῦν δὲ σὴν ταρβῶ τρίχα.
τί χρῆν με δρᾶσαι; δύο γὰρ ἀντίθες δυοῖν·
πατὴρ μὲν ἐφύτευσέν με, σὴ δ' ἔτικτε παῖς,
τὸ σπέρμ' ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦσ' ἄλλου πάρα.
ἡ σὴ δὲ θυγάτηρ (μητέρ' αἰδοῦμαι λέγειν)
ἰδίοισιν ὑμεναίοισι κοὐχὶ σώφροσιν
ἐς ἀνδρὸς ᾔει λέκτρ'· ἐμαυτόν, ἢν λέγω

[1] In 580 transmitted φόνον δικάζων cannot be right since active δικάζω means 'judge' or 'adjudge'. I now favor Weil's φόνον δικαιῶν in preference to Willink's φόνου δικαστῶν.

[2] I omit here 585-7, transposed by D. to follow 578. They don't fit particularly well there, but rather than delete them with Reeve, I put them before 600.

[3] The emphasis in 593 on the fact that 'we' (all mortals) obey Apollo in everything is rhetorically welcome, and we can save the line by adopting Weil's καὶ for ᾧ: see *RPh* 18 (1894), 207-8.

κακῶς ἐκείνην, αἴσχρ' ἐρῶ· λέξω δ' ὅμως.
τοῦτον κατέκτειν', ἐπὶ δ' ἔθυσα μητέρα,
ἀνόσια μὲν δρῶν, ἀλλὰ τιμωρῶν πατρί.
μισῶν δὲ μητέρ' ἐνδίκως ἀπώλεσα,
ἥτις μεθ' ὅπλων ἄνδρ' ἀπόντ' ἐκ δωμάτων
πάσης ὑπὲρ γῆς Ἑλλάδος στρατηλάτην
προύδωκε κοὐκ ἔσωσ' ἀκήρατον λέχος·
ἐπεὶ δ' ἁμαρτοῦσ' ᾔσθετ', οὐχ αὑτῇ δίκην
ἐπέθηκεν, ἀλλ', ὡς μὴ δίκην δοίη πόσει,
ἐζημίωσε πατέρα κἀπέκτειν' ἐμόν.
    πρὸς θεῶν—ἐν οὐ καλῷ μὲν ἐμνήσθην θεῶν
φόνον δικαιῶν· εἰ δὲ δὴ τὰ μητέρος
σιγῶν ἐπῄνουν, τί μ' ἂν ἔδρασ' ὁ κατθανών;
οὐκ ἄν με μισῶν ἀνεχόρευ' Ἐρινύσιν;
ἢ μητρὶ μὲν πάρεισι σύμμαχοι θεαί,
τῷ δ' οὐ πάρεισι, μᾶλλον ἠδικημένῳ;
    ὁρᾷς Ἀπόλλω γ', ὃς μεσομφάλους ἕδρας
ναίων βροτοῖσι στόμα νέμει σαφέστατον
καὶ πειθόμεσθα πάνθ' ὅσ' ἂν κεῖνος λέγῃ;
τούτῳ πιθόμενος τὴν τεκοῦσαν ἔκτανον.
ἐκεῖνον ἡγεῖσθ' ἀνόσιον καὶ κτείνετε·
ἐκεῖνος ἥμαρτ', οὐκ ἐγώ. τί χρῆν με δρᾶν;
ἢ οὐκ ἀξιόχρεως ὁ θεὸς ἀναφέροντί μοι
μίασμα λῦσαι; ποῖ τις οὖν ἔτ' ἂν φύγοι,
εἰ μὴ κελεύσας ῥύσεταί με μὴ θανεῖν;
    σύ τοι φυτεύσας θυγατέρ', ὦ γέρον, κακὴν
ἀπώλεσάς με· διὰ τὸ κείνης γὰρ θράσος
πατρὸς στερηθεὶς ἐγενόμην μητροκτόνος.
ἀλλ' ὡς μὲν οὐκ εὖ μὴ λέγ' εἴργασται τάδε,
ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς δράσασιν οὐκ εὐδαιμόνως.

696-716

ὅταν γὰρ ἡβᾷ δῆμος εἰς ὀργὴν πεσών,
ὅμοιον ὥστε πῦρ κατασβέσαι λάβρον·
εἰ δ' ἡσύχως τις αὐτὸν ἐντείνοντι μὲν
χαλῶν ὑπείκοι καιρὸν εὐλαβούμενος,
ἴσως ἂν ἐκπνεύσειεν· ἣν δ' ἀνῇ πνοάς,

τύχοις ἂν αὐτοῦ ῥᾳδίως ὅσον θέλεις.
[ἔνεστι δ' οἶκτος, ἔνι δὲ καὶ θυμὸς μέγας,
καραδοκοῦντι κτῆμα τιμιώτατον.]
ἐλθὼν δ' ἐγώ σοι Τυνδάρεων πειράσομαι
πόλιν τε πεῖσαι τῷ λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς.
[καὶ ναῦς γὰρ ἐνταθεῖσα πρὸς βίαν ποδὶ
ἔβαψεν, ἔστη δ' αὖθις ἢν χαλᾷ πόδα.]
μισεῖ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰς ἄγαν προθυμίας,
μισοῦσι δ' ἀστοί· δεῖ δέ μ' (οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω)
σῴζειν σε σοφίᾳ, μὴ βίᾳ τῶν κρεισσόνων.
ἀλκῇ δέ σ' οὐκ ἄν, ᾗ σὺ δοξάζεις ἴσως,
σώσαιμ' ἄν· οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον λόγχῃ μιᾷ
στῆσαι τροπαῖα τῶν κακῶν ἅ σοι πάρα.
[οὐ γάρ ποτ' Ἄργους γαῖαν ἐς τὸ μαλθακὸν
προσηγόμεσθα· νῦν δ' ἀναγκαίως ἔχει
δούλοισιν εἶναι τοῖς σοφοῖσι τῆς τύχης.]

702-3 del. Hartung (1837) 704 δ' ἐγώ σοι τυν- γρMC: δὲ τυν- τέ σοι codd. (δὲ τυν- σοὶ τὲ L) τυνδάρεω VL 705 πόλει V(~V1s) πεῖσαι] πείσας Hermann, πείθων Weil 706-7 del. Harberton, denuo Gow 711-3 suspectos habuit Wecklein 714-6 del. Dindorf (tantum 716 Murray 714 Ἄργου γρΣmbc (γράφεται δὲ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ σ, ἵν' ᾖ Ἄργου γαῖαν· Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ μετὰ τοῦ σ) γαῖαν] γ' ἕνεκ' ἂν Hermann

It is good to be reminded, as Jackson reminds us at *MS* 14, that 'on more than one occasion Euripides has shown himself less logical than Herwerden'. But you do not have to be a Herwerden to feel that all is not well in Menelaus' reply to Orestes. Consider Menelaus' argument. I want to help you, he says, but I can't. I do not have sufficient armed might to challenge all of Argos (682-93[-5]). When the common people get in a rage and act in a headstrong manner, they are as unmanageable as a great fire. Opposing their intemperate passions directly is pointless, but if you don't try to, they may blow themselves out: when they do, you can get what you want. There's not only passion but also pity in them, and this can be a great boon to the man who waits (696-703, the last two lines of which are suspect).

When we reach 704-5, incoherence strikes. Whether we read 704 with the mss. or with the γράφεται variant, Menelaus here promises

to go and persuade Tyndareus and the city to 'make good use of their excessiveness' (τῷ λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς). The phrase is incoherent. Willink takes it to mean 'show moderation', but his examples of χρῆσθαι καλῶς are of making good use of qualities that are good or at least neutral: people who 'make good use' continue to keep those qualities, without, however, falling into the vices that can attend them. If, for example, Hippolytus had 'made good use of' his chastity, he would still have been chaste but would also have avoided his condemnation of others' weakness. It is therefore unlikely that 'to make good use of one's excessivenss' means 'give up excessiveness and become moderate'. (Theoretically it might mean 'to make good use of [someone else's] excessiveness', e.g. by waiting until someone whose emotions are all excessive has one that can be turned to good use. But unless we rewrite 704-5, it cannot bear this meaning here.)

Even if we were to concede that τῷ λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς can mean what Willink says it should, 704-5 are surprising in the extreme. Menelaus has just talked about the difficulty of confronting an angry *demos* head-on and urged the necessity of waiting for its passions to blow themselves out. Why should he then say that he is going to tackle *Tyndareus and the city*, both of them in just the kind of mood Menelaus has said must not be met head-on?[1] Willink takes 704-7 together to mean that Menelaus will attempt to mollify Tyndareus, 'but he is contemplating only the single exercise of πειθώ, the hope being that the "ship" (πόλις) will right *itself* if not put under the extra strain of Tynd.'s violent urging (612-14)'. But would Euripides make Menelaus say 'Tyndareus and the city' if he really means only Tyndareus? And is the little allegory Willink finds here clear enough to make this plain? I fear the answer to both questions is 'no'.

It is not only 696-701 that cast doubt on 704-5: so does Orestes' reply in 717-24. There he accuses Menelaus of failure to defend his kin, except for his wife. He also accuses him of rejecting a suppliant and running away. But if we believe the mss. Menelaus has just promised to do something concrete and given reasons why he cannot

[1] This tells also against Weil's πείθων, 'I shall attempt, by persuading Tyndareus and the city, to make good use of their excessiveness': how is 'persuading' the city any different from opposing its will, the very thing Menelaus says one cannot do at the moment?

take other steps. If we like we can interpret Orestes' words as a prediction (accurate, as the event showed) that Menelaus will do nothing. Or we can say that they show an Orestes being unreasonable in his expectations, treating as insignificant Menelaus' important concession that he would tackle Tyndareus. I cannot prove that these interpretations are false, but it seems more likely to me that 704-5, clumsy in expression and fitting badly in their immediate context, are interpolated. I confess I cannot divine the interpolator's motives.

Removing the lines has the good consequence that 706-10 now join up very well with 701 (or even with 703, if we do not delete 702-3 with Hartung). Menelaus is still giving reasons why he cannot act, this time drawing his imagery from sea-faring: tightening the sheet in a storm leads to capsizing, while loosening it puts the ship upright again, a good metaphor for the tactical retreat Menelaus proposes. The next two lines make the point that excessive enthusiasm of any kind will be checked by heaven and will in time disgust the citizens. This leads to a line-and-a-half summarizing his position: he must rescue Orestes by skill or cleverness, not in the teeth of superior force. The whole passage now reads like the attempt of a coward to excuse himself from courageous action. His implicit promise to act at a later time ignores, of course, the fact that today is the day when Orestes and Electra are in danger of being condemned to death.

The next three lines (711-3) were suspected by Wecklein. The point they make has already been made at 688-92, which quite sufficiently establish that Menelaus cannot call on a large army to force Argos to spare Orestes. He has moved on from that point to a further one, that even non-forcible intervention is futile before the people's anger has had a chance to abate. It is odd that he returns to this argument, especially with a phrase, ᾗ σὺ δοξάζεις ἴσως, that might give the impression that the point has never been raised. But the lines are crisp and in the best Euripidean manner, and perhaps the repetitiveness serves to characterize: Menelaus has been vague about what he actually will do, and to sound more resolute he ends by returning to the strong point (forcible intervention is impossible) with which he began.

How about the last three lines, bracketed by D.? As Willink says, the last line-and-a-half are blameless and make an effective exit line: 'the wise must be slaves of fortune'. As for the first line-and-a-half,

their difficulties are more likely to be signs of corruption than of spuriousness: they cannot be plausibly translated or paraphrased, and why would an interpolator produce such a passage? Furthermore, the scholiast knew a text with αργου instead of Ἄργους. Willink's suggestion, οὐ γάρ ποτ' ⟨ἐκ τ⟩ἀργοῦ γ' ἂν ἐς τὸ μαλθακὸν / προσηγόμεσθα, 'I would not be led to adopt such a soft policy out of idleness', is much more plausible than any alternative known to me. I transcribe the speech as restored.[1]

Ὀρέστ', ἐγώ τοι σὸν καταιδοῦμαι κάρα
καὶ ξυμπονῆσαι σοῖς κακοῖσι βούλομαι.
τοῦ δ' αὖ δύνασθαι πρὸς θεῶν χρῄζω τυχεῖν.
ἥκω γὰρ ἀνδρῶν συμμάχων κενὸν δόρυ
ἔχων, πόνοισι μυρίοις ἀλώμενος,
σμικρᾷ σὺν ἀλκῇ τῶν λελειμμένων φίλων.
μάχῃ μὲν οὖν ἂν οὐχ ὑπερβαλοίμεθα
Πελασγὸν Ἄργος· εἰ δὲ μαλθακοῖς λόγοις
δυναίμεθ', ἐνταῦθ' ἐλπίδος προήκομεν.
ὅταν γὰρ ἡβᾷ δῆμος εἰς ὀργὴν πεσών,
ὅμοιον ὥστε πῦρ κατασβέσαι λάβρον·
εἰ δ' ἡσύχως τις αὑτὸν ἐντείνοντι μὲν
χαλῶν ὑπείκοι καιρὸν εὐλαβούμενος,
ἴσως ἂν ἐκπνεύσειεν· ὅτε δ' ἀνῇ πνοάς,
τύχοις ἂν αὐτοῦ ῥᾳδίως ὅσον θέλεις.
καὶ ναῦς γὰρ ἐνταθεῖσα πρὸς βίαν ποδὶ
ἔβαψεν, ἔστη δ' αὖθις ἢν χαλᾷ πόδα.
μισεῖ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰς ἄγαν προθυμίας,
μισοῦσι δ' ἀστοί· δεῖ δέ μ' (οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω)
σῴζειν σε σοφίᾳ, μὴ βίᾳ τῶν κρεισσόνων.
ἀλκῇ δέ σ' οὐκ ἄν, ᾗ σὺ δοξάζεις ἴσως,
σώσαιμ' ἄν· οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον λόγχῃ μιᾷ
στῆσαι τροπαῖα τῶν κακῶν ἅ σοι πάρα.

[1] In addition to deletions already mentioned, I delete 684-6 with Reeve, *GRBS* 14 (1973), 157: 'fighting the enemy and dying' are no part of what Menelaus is being asked to do, and δύναμιν in 685 'takes the force out of' τὸ δ' αὖ δύνασθαι in 687, particularly the αὖ. (Reeve's objection to ὁμαιμόνων, by contrast, is answered by Willink *ad loc.*) I also adopt Weil's deletion of 694-5, *RPh* 18 (1894), 208, since the γὰρ in 696 does not explain why it is absurd to hope that slight exertions will win big prizes but why 'soft words' are Menelaus' only recourse.

οὐ γάρ ποτ' ⟨ἐκ τ⟩ἀργοῦ γ' ἂν ἐς τὸ μαλθακὸν
προσηγόμεσθα· νῦν δ' ἀναγκαίως ἔχει
δούλοισιν εἶναι τοῖς σοφοῖσι τῆς τύχης.

Deletion of 704-5 has one further consequence. When our text had Menelaus promising to have a word with 'Tyndareus and the city', it was necessary to send him by Eisodos B into the city, on the heels of Tyndareus. Now, however, he can be sent back the way he came, down Eisodos A. This clears up the last minor difficulty regarding the use of the two eisodoi. It was somewhat inconvenient that Menelaus should go off by Eisodos B after delivering 716 and then Pylades should enter by the same eisodos only eleven lines later. Now traffic congestion in the eisodos is avoided.[1]

782

Ορ. καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμά γ' ἔνδικόν μοι. Πυ. τοῦ δοκεῖν ἔχου μόνον

782 τοῦ Lenting: τὸ ΩZT^{t1}: τῷ(ι) GLX et K^{1c}: καὶ τὸ T^{t3} ἔχου Lenting: εὔχου codd. et Σ^{mbvc}

Murray, whose credo was 'plus interpretationis eget, me iudice, Euripides quam emendationis', interpreted the reading of GLX and the first corrector of K by writing τῷ Δοκεῖν εὔχου μόνον, turning the infinitive into a divinity by means of a capital letter. This is more ingenious than convincing.

Jackson, *MS* 77-8, Willink, and D. all agree on the text printed above. Willink, unlike the other two, mentions Paley's τόδε δοκεῖν εὔχου μόνον but considers it 'relatively feeble'. West by contrast prints Paley but makes no comment.

West made the right choice. No matter how one translates τοῦ δοκεῖν ἔχου, Lenting's conjecture is implausibly cryptic. If we translate 'Cleave to seeming' it is unclear what or who is to do the seeming

---

1 It is no argument against this staging that in 1058 Orestes says Menelaus 'never showed his face': this does not imply that he himself expected that he would. Electra, to whom he is speaking, had been absent during the interchange with Menelaus, and she is surprised at his failure to speak on their behalf. Orestes' οὐδ' ὄμμ' ἔδειξεν tells Electra all she needs to know, that he did not help them and did not even appear. This is compatible with his having gone off in an entirely different direction.

and what quality they are to seem to have. 'Just keep thinking so' is better, but can Pylades really be recommending, as it were, the power of positive thinking? By contrast, 'Just pray that it may seem so' is the perfect and perspicuous reply to 'And my case has justice on its side'.

Paley's conjecture allows us to explain the corruption much more simply than Lenting's. Haplography reduced ΤΟΔΕΔΟ to ΤΟΔΟ. In one part of the tradition the missing short was compensated by lengthening τὸ to τῶ(ι), creating nonsense in order to produce meter. In another part, comic meter was produced by writing καὶ τὸ. With Lenting's conjecture, by contrast, we must change two separate parts of the line, neither change clearly causing the other (this point made by di Benedetto). It is also hard to account for the clearly unmetrical τὸ on the hypothesis that the original was τοῦ. Paley's conjecture, then, gives incomparably better sense at considerably less cost.

1160-2

νῦν τ' αὖ δίδως μοι πολεμίων τιμωρίαν
κοὐκ ἐκποδὼν εἶ· παύσομαί σ' αἰνῶν, ἐπεὶ
βάρος τι κἀν τῷδ' ἐστίν, αἰνεῖσθαι λίαν.

Orestes is addressing Pylades and praising him as a steadfast friend. Then he says he will stop, explaining that he does not want his praise to cause offense or annoyance. Between the praise and the promise to stop we seem to require an adversative: asyndeton does not seem called for. Read παύσομαι δ' αἰνῶν σ'.

1344-52

Ερ. ἰδού, διώκω τὸν ἐμὸν ἐς δόμους πόδα.
σώθηθ' ὅσον γε τοὐπ' ἔμ'. Ηλ. ὦ κατὰ στέγας
φίλοι ξιφήρεις, οὐχὶ συλλήψεσθ' ἄγραν;
[Ερ. οἴ 'γώ· τίνας τούσδ' εἰσορῶ; Ορ. σιγᾶν χρεών·
ἡμῖν γὰρ ἥκεις, οὐχὶ σοί, σωτηρία.]
(Ηλ.) ἔχεσθ' ἔχεσθε· φάσγανον δὲ πρὸς δέρῃ
βαλόντες ἡσυχάζεθ', ὡς εἰδῇ τόδε

Μενέλαος, οὕνεκ' ἄνδρας, οὐ Φρύγας κακούς,
εὑρὼν ἔπραξεν οἷα χρὴ πράσσειν κακούς.

1347-8 del. Willink (1347a [—εἰσορῶ] om. M, ~Σ^{m}) 1347^{n} 'Ορ.] 'Ηλ. Lachmann, recte si hi vv. Euripidis sunt; [Π^{16}] 1349^{n} nullam paragr. Π^{16}: 'Ηλ. ΩXZT^{t3}: [S]

Three questions arise in connection with these lines. (1) Are 1347-8 interpolated (thus Willink, who persuaded D.)? (2) If they are genuine, do 1347b-1348 belong to Orestes, as in the ms. tradition, or to Electra, as apparently in the papyrus? (3) What was the staging? Does Electra speak 1347a from within the *skene*, does she see Orestes and Pylades while standing in the doorway, or do Orestes and Pylades emerge from the *skene* to escort her inside?

(1) Willink thinks that actors have added an 'enactment' of the arrest, perhaps to increase the liveliness of the scene. This is possible, of course, but I do not think it is demonstrable or even likely. He says that without 1347-8 we have 'an entirely normal' scene-ending. That would count as a reason if Euripides' practice never varied, but it does. Willink says that the language is mediocre since the phrasing of 1347a resembles *El.* 341, *Cyc.* 222. But Euripides does write quasi-formulaicly, and so 1347a is exactly in his manner, not identical to his phrasing elsewhere but similar. He says further that the γάρ is illogical ('be silent, *for* it is *to us* that you bring salvation') and that οὐχὶ σοί, coming after Hermione's exit-words σώθηθ' ὅσον γε τοὐπ' ἔμ', is 'positively silly'. But the point of 1348 is that Hermione's coming will bring rescue to the siblings (as she had hoped) but only at the cost of her death or the threat of it: hence (this is the force of γάρ) crying out to her determined captors, who are saving their own lives by means of hers, will do no good.

Willink also argues that these lines contradict the Phrygian messenger-aria (1490ff.), according to which 'Hermione enters the Palace while Or. and Pyl. are otherwise employed; they then run upon her like maenads seizing a wild animal'. But in the Phrygian's aria the escaped servants have been killed or put to flight at the point when Hermione enters, and there is no reason to think that Orestes and Pylades are unavailable. The Phrygian's words are certainly compatible with the supposition that Orestes and Pylades, answering

Electra's call, come and seize Hermione just as she enters the house, which is also what must happen with Willink's text. They appear to exclude only the appearance of Orestes and Pylades in front of the palace. No need, therefore, to delete.

(2) A papyrus fragment of the second to first century B. C. has no paragraphos at 1349, thereby confirming Lachmann's suggestion that we should assign 1347b-1348, along with 1349-52, to Electra. This eliminates two alternative anomalies: either a jack-in-the-box entrance by Orestes and Pylades (this is possible but contradicts the Phrygian, who speaks of Hermione's arrival, not her attackers' departure) or a dialogue between two persons within. The assignment to Electra, by contrast, seems problem-free. Willink's objection, that if Hermione has already gone in Electra has lost the contact with her implied by her command to be silent, fails to reckon with passages where choruses and others outside the *skene* address words to victims indoors that are not intended to be heard: see *El.* 1170-1, *HF* 755-6 (note imperative), and S. *El.* 1411-2. The papyrus assignment should therefore be accepted.

(3) This leaves us with a choice of staging: either send Hermione indoors after 1345a or place her in the doorway, reacting in 1347a to the sight, visible to her but probably not to the spectators, of Orestes and Pylades within. West says that the former is impossible because having promised to escort Hermione (ἐγὼ δ' ἡγήσομαι, 1342), Electra must not stay behind. I doubt, however, we can infer from 1342 that she will enter the house first: if she allows Hermione to enter first and follows after a few seconds, she has fulfilled the expectations she has created, even supposing that expectations raised in a speech intended to deceive have to be so scrupulously carried out. Both stagings are thus theoretically possible. It cannot be objected that Electra's call to Orestes and Pylades to seize their prey would give the game away too soon if Hermione is not already within: the girl is not in a position to defend herself or flee, and at this point it does not matter if she knows she is walking into a trap. But one slight consideration seems to tip the balance in favor of the entry after 1345a: if Hermione already knows that she is walking into a trap, then although it is impossible for her to escape, it would be difficult to imagine her going of her own free will, like Cassandra in Aeschylus, to meet her death. Yet for Electra to physically shove her seems

contrary to convention. Better then to have her enter in ignorance. Once she is inside, Electra can stand at the door and call within to Orestes and Pylades, Hermione can voice her reaction to the unexpected sight of two armed men, and Electra can comment, less for Hermione's benefit than for her own, on the split between Hermione's interests and those of Electra and Orestes. When Electra has ascertained that Orestes and Pylades have carried out her command οὐχὶ συλλήψεσθ' ἄγραν; she urges them to keep a grip on her. After casting aspersions on Menelaus' valor, she goes inside herself.[1]

1366-74

[ἀλλὰ κτυπεῖ γὰρ κλῇθρα βασιλείων δόμων,
σιγήσατ'· ἔξω γάρ τις ἐκβαίνει Φρυγῶν,
οὗ πευσόμεσθα τἀν δόμοις ὅπως ἔχει.]

ΦΡΥΞ

Ἀργέιον ξίφος ἐκ θανάτου
πέφευγα βαρβάροις ἐν εὐ-
μάρισιν κεδρωτὰ πα-
στάδων ὑπὲρ τέραμνα
Δωρικάς τε τριγλύφους,
φροῦδα φροῦδα, Γᾶ Γᾶ,
βαρβάροισι δρασμοῖς.

1366-8 histrionibus imputat Σ^{mbc}: pro genuinis suppositos esse veri simile est

Are 1366-8 interpolated? There are two kinds of evidence, the testimony of the scholiast and the sense of 1370-2, which seem to mean that the Phrygian makes his entrance not through the door but from the upper portions of the *skene*. If 1366-8 are interpolated, we must suppose that genuine verses announcing the entrance were lost.

Let us consider the scholiast first (Σ^{mtb} on 1366):

[1] I had already written this note when I found much of it anticipated by E. Medda, *SIFC* 17 (1999), 56-65, who criticizes in detail the arguments of J. R. Porter, *Studies in Euripides'* Orestes (Leiden, 1994), pp. 342-4.

τούτους δὲ τοὺς τρεῖς στίχους οὐκ ἄν τις ἐξ ἑτοίμου συγχωρήσειεν Εὐριπίδου εἶναι ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, οἵτινες, ἵνα μὴ κακοπαθῶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν βασιλείων δόμων καθαλλόμενοι, παρανοίξαντες ἐκπορεύονται τὸ τοῦ Φρυγὸς ἔχοντες σχῆμα καὶ πρόσωπον. ὅπως οὖν διὰ τῆς θύρας εὐλόγως ἐξιόντες φαίνωνται, τούτους προσενέταξαν. ἐξ ὧν δὲ αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, ἀντιμαρτυροῦσι τῇ διὰ τῶν θυρῶν ἐξόδῳ. φανερὸν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἑξῆς ὅτι ὑπερπεπήδηκεν.

The scholiast makes no appeal to any manuscript lacking these lines, nor does he cite performance tradition. He is giving his own opinion ('one would not willing ascribe these three lines to Euripides'), and it seems that the whole basis for his opinion is that 'what follows' implies that the Phrygian's entrance is not through the door. Everything he says about actors' intervention is an inference from the text. We must therefore thank him for his interesting observation but decline to treat him as an authority on a matter we can decide, on precisely the same evidence available to him, for ourselves.[1]

If 1370-2 imply that the Phrygian leapt down from the upper storey (or the roof) of the *skene*, then we cannot retain 1366-8, which clearly imply entrance through the door. But, as Willink points out, such acrobatics would be without parallel on the Greek stage. There is no reason to postulate them here since there is an alternative way of interpreting the text compatible with an entrance through the door. We can suppose that 1370-2 describe obstacles the Phrygian had to surmount in the (imagined) inner portions of the palace (thus Dale, but before her the scholiast on 1371: ταῦτα οὖν φησιν, ὡς ὑπερπεπηδηκὼς τῶν ἔσω τινὰς οἴκων. παστάδων γὰρ τῶν θαλάμων). Nor is this confusing to the audience: if they have seen the Phrygian emerge from the door, they will interpret his words about surmounting rafter-beams and triglyphs as a reference to the interior, especially if παστάδων, as the scholiast twice claims, refers to bedrooms, surely part of the palace's interior.[2] It might be felt that the Phrygian is tragedy's most outlandish character and that an outlandish mode of

---

[1] This point was made by A. M. Dale, 'Seen and Unseen in Greek Drama', *WS* 69 (1956), 103-4 (=*Collected Papers* [Cambridge, 1969], pp. 126-7).

[2] Rather less likely is Willink's suggestion (also supported by the scholiast) that ὑπέρ means 'beyond the confines of': West's argument against this, *CQ* 37 (1987), 289-90, seem cogent.

entry would be in character. But oddities in one sphere provide no reason for postulating other oddities for which there is no textual basis.

1465-7

ἁ δ' ἀνίαχεν ἴαχεν· Ἰώ μοί μοι.
λευκὸν δ' ἐμβαλοῦσα πῆχυν στέρνοις
†κτύπησεν κρᾶτα† μέλεον πλαγάν, κτλ.

1467 κάρᾳ τε κτύπησε vel κτύπησεν κάρᾳ τε Willink (κτύπησεν iam Hermann)

West's translation of 1466-7 reads 'and clapping her pale forearm to her chest she beat her head a sorry blow'. This is not plausible: when you wish to beat your head you do not clap your arm to your chest. We need to find a connective to join chest and head as objects of the blow. In one way, however, West makes the right choice: to express 'strike a blow to one's head' we expect two accusatives, one internal and one external. This seems more stylish than the dative, which risks creating the impression that it goes with ἐμβαλοῦσα. Read στέρνα (Weil) / κτύπησεν κάρα ⟨τε⟩ (Willink *olim*) μέλεον πλαγάν.

1524-36

Ορ. εὖ λέγεις· σῴζει σε σύνεσις. ἀλλὰ βαῖν' ἔσω δόμων.
Φρ. οὐκ ἄρα κτενεῖς μ'; Ορ. ἀφεῖσαι. Φρ. καλὸν ἔπος λέγεις τόδε.
Ορ. ἀλλὰ μεταβουλευσόμεσθα. Φρ. τοῦτο δ' οὐ καλῶς λέγεις.
Ορ. μῶρος, εἰ δοκεῖς με τλῆναί σ' ἂν καθαιμάξαι δέρην·
οὔτε γὰρ γυνὴ πέφυκας οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν σύ γ' εἶ.
τοῦ δὲ μὴ στῆσαί σε κραυγὴν οὕνεκ' ἐξῆλθον δόμων
(ὀξὺ γὰρ βοῆς ἀκοῦσαν Ἄργος ἐξεγείρεται)·
Μενέλεων δ' οὐ τάρβος ἡμῖν ἀναλαβεῖν ἔσω ξίφους·
ἀλλ' ἴτω ξανθοῖς ἐπ' ὤμων βοστρύχοις γαυρούμενος.
[εἰ γὰρ Ἀργείους ἐπάξει τοῖσδε δώμασιν λαβών,
τὸν Ἑλένης φόνον διώκων, κἀμὲ μὴ σῴζειν θέλῃ

σύγγονόν τ' ἐμὴν Πυλάδην τε τὸν τάδε ξυνδρῶντά μοι,
παρθένον τε καὶ δάμαρτα δύο νεκρὼ κατόψεται.]

1533-6 del. Seidensticker (Festschr. P. Moraux 1 [1985] 452), 1535 iam Paley

There are several problems arising from the relation of this scene, the tetrameter scene between the Phrygian and Orestes, to the next, the scene between Orestes and Menelaus, problems that cohere closely and would seem to benefit from being discussed together. Some scholars (Grüninger, Wecklein) have argued that the whole tetrameter scene is an interpolation, and perhaps 1503-5 as well. D., following a tentative suggestion of Seidensticker, prefers to delete only 1533-6.[1] Other deletions, in the next scene, have been proposed. The following discussion will argue for the essential integrity of the text.

The problems are as follows. (1) Who brings the news to Menelaus that Orestes and Pylades have attacked Helen and are threatening Hermione, the Phrygian or some imagined person who has escaped from the unseen side of the palace? One argument against the genuineness of the tetrameter scene is that without it the Phrygian, having finished his aria, leaves the stage to bring the news to Menelaus, who enters in the next scene with precisely the knowledge the Phrygian could have supplied. If we retain the scene, it is argued, the Phrygian must go back into the palace (cf. 1524) and is unavailable to inform Menelaus. Defenders of the scene were forced to invent some other news-bearer, whom the audience never sees. (2) Why does Orestes apparently speak in this scene as if he had succeeded in killing Helen (1534, 1536, possibly 1512), whereas later (1580, 1582-4, 1614) he goes out of his way to insist to Menelaus that he has failed? (3) What is the relation between the danger to Orestes that the Argives will hear of the attack and come to the rescue (1529-30), and the danger that Menelaus will come (1510 in D.'s text, 1531-2)? Should they be combined, as they are in 1533-4?

[1] B. Seidensticker, 'The Authenticity of Eur. Or. 1503-1536', in J. Wiesner, ed., *Aristotles Werk und Wirkung: Paul Moraux Gewidmet* (Berlin, 1985-6), i. 446-56, here 452.

(1) Willink has solved the question of the Phrygian as message-bearer by a simple suggestion. He takes μεταβουλευσόμεσθα in 1526 to mean that Orestes has had second thoughts about sending the Phrygian inside, realizing, as 1531-2 suggest, that he can and must deal with Menelaus and that the Phrygian could have a useful role in bringing about their meeting. His second thoughts thus cancel the order to go inside, and the Phrygian is available as news-bearer after all.[1] This is welcome since the unseen news-bearer, traveling, as it were, backstage, is without parallel in Euripides.[2]

(2) The Phrygian in his aria tells the Chorus (1494-1502) that Orestes and Pylades attempted to kill Helen but that she mysteriously disappeared:

πάλιν δὲ τᾶς Διὸς κόρας
ἐπὶ σφαγὰν ἔτεινον· ἁ δ' [ἐκ θαλάμων]
ἐγένετο διαπρὸ δωμάτων ἄφαντος,
ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ Γᾶ καὶ Φῶς καὶ Νύξ,
ἤτοι φαρμάκοις
ἢ μάγων τέχναις ἢ θεῶν κλοπαῖς.
τὰ δ' ὕστερ' οὐκέτ' οἶδα· δραπέταν γὰρ ἐξ-
έκλεπτον ἐκ δόμων πόδα.
πολύπονα δὲ πολύπονα πάθεα Μενέλας
ἀνσχόμενος ἀνόνατον ⟨ἀνόνατον⟩ ἀπο-
⟨πρὸ⟩ Τροίας ἔλαβε τὸν Ἑλένας γάμον.

[1] Note that whoever wrote 1556-60, whether Euripides or an interpolator, clearly envisaged the Phrygian as Menelaus' informant. I discuss the genuineness of these lines below.

[2] Seidensticker, pp. 453-4, adopts the suggestion of Page, *AI* 46, that some slave climbed over the palace wall on the other side from the audience and made his way unseen to Menelaus. In Euripides, the only parallels produced so far for a character appearing because he has heard news we have not seen anyone bring him are from the beginnings of plays, e.g. that Creon has heard about Medea's threats against him, his daughter, and his son-in-law (*Med.* 287-8) or Pentheus about the bacchic women's behavior (*Ba.* 215ff.). In these instances the conveying of the news is deemed to have happened before the beginning of the play. (These examples are adduced by M. J. O'Brien, 'The Authenticity of *Orestes* 1503-1536', in M. Cropp et al., edd., *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy* [Calgary, 1986], 213-27 [here 216].) Euripidean practice apparently disallows Page's suggestion. (On this matter Aeschylus and Sophocles are not so fussy: cf. the beginning of *Agamemnon*, where a message ordering sacrifices to be made around the city is sent invisibly from the palace and has effect before the chorus have entered, and *OT*, where it is not made clear how word reaches Creon that Oedipus has been accusing him of treason.)

'Then back they turned to the slaying of Zeus's daughter. But she passed through the house and vanished—O Zeus and Earth, O Daylight and Dark Night—either by drugs or magicians' contrivance or stolen away by the gods. What happened thereafter I do not know: I stole my feet from the house and ran. Though Menelaus has endured trouble and toil, toil, it was all in vain <in vain> that from Troy he brought home Helen his wife.'

The Phrygian thinks that Helen is gone for good, but he clearly does not think that this was Orestes' doing since he gives a string of supernatural explanations for her disappearance. Why, then, is Orestes made to speak as he does? Willink's explanation is twofold. On the level of authorial strategy, he argues, one of the play's most important effects is the surprise at the end of the play that Helen is still alive, and the poet has contrived a multiple *suggestio falsi*, creating the impression that Helen has actually been killed, in order to set up and augment this final surprise. On the level of Orestes' intentions, it is in Orestes' interest to make Menelaus think that he has killed Helen so that he will take the threat to Hermione the more seriously. Accordingly, Willink deletes the passage (1579-84) where Orestes insists that he has not killed Helen. I argue below that that passage is genuine and that Orestes is not acting the way a modern hostage-taker might act. As for *suggestio falsi*, it is clear that this is an important part of Euripides' design,[1] though I will suggest below that other factors besides deliberate mystification are necessary to explain 1533-6.

Orestes' statement (1536) that if Menelaus attacks the palace with Argives he will see his wife's as well as his daughter's corpse *is* puzzling in view of both the Phrygian's aria, describing the disappearance of Helen, and Orestes' later remarks denying that he killed

[1] Plainly such ἔνδοθεν cries as ὄλλυμαι κακῶς (1296) and θνῄσκω (1301) normally imply a successful backstage murder, and it follows that the audience must suppose for a few minutes that Helen is dead. 1395-9 and 1491 likewise suggest that Helen has been killed. The description of Helen's baffling disappearance effaces this suggestion, and by 1494 it is plain that Orestes and Pylades have not succeeded: it is Helen, not her corpse (as Willink on 1494-7 parenthetically suggests), that 'was nowhere to be seen throughout the house', ἃ δ' [ἐκ θαλάμων] ἐγένετο διαπρὸ δωμάτων ἄφαντος (1494-5). The Phrygian's final lines about the futility of Menelaus' attempt to get Helen back from Troy leave the impression that we will never see her again. This helps to set up the surprise at the end of the play.

her.[1] Though 1534 could be regarded as describing only Menelaus' purpose, not the facts of the situation, with 1536 we reach a more substantial problem, for παρθένον τε καὶ δάμαρτα δύο νεκρὼ κατόψεται implies Helen's dead body.

Willink (ad 1536) suggests that these words are for Menelaus' benefit and that Orestes is bluffing, trying to show Menelaus that he is serious about killing Hermione by claiming to have killed already. The trouble is that he doesn't carry out this plausible plan and admits—indeed insists on—his lack of success (1579-84). Willink wants to delete the latter passage, but the deletion, as we will see, has highly unwelcome consequences.[2]

To many scholars the conclusion is clear: there is a contradiction that cannot be accepted, and either we must delete the whole scene with Grüninger or 1533-6 with Seidensticker. Interpolation of a whole scene in tetrameters seems an unlikely possbility.[3] By contrast, of the four lines Seidensticker deletes, one has a metrical problem.[4] This would seem to be a cogent case for deletion on 1533-6. I shall revisit this conclusion below.

(3) 1533 envisages the possibility that Menelaus may arrive bringing the Argives with him, whereas earlier Menelaus and the Argives are contrasted and kept distinct. Orestes contrasts them in 1529-32 when he says that his purpose in coming out was to make

---

[1] We should probably not worry about 1512: in light of *Ion* 1500, ἔκτεινά σ' ἄκουσ', we could either suppose that the aorist διώλετο could be used of an action that was not carried out (cf. *Ion* 1500, ἔκτεινά σ' ἄκουσ') or that διώλετο doesn't mean 'was killed (by me)' but 'perished (by mysterious means)'.

[2] There is one other expedient to create consistency in Orestes' attitude, and it is a desperate one, to imagine that Orestes, though cheated of his victim the first time, imagines that she must still be lurking in the palace: by 1579-84 he has made a search and realized that Helen is not there. This is the view of A. P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived: Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford, 1971), p. 192. The possibility is canvassed by Seidensticker, p. 451. But this flies in the face of the impression, created by the Phrygian's words in 1494-7, that her disappearance was uncanny, suggesting the supernatural. After hearing these words the audience are not likely to think, 'Orestes must suppose she is concealed behind a door'. The same impression is conveyed by Orestes' reply to Menelaus in 1568: θεοὺς ἀπαιτεῖ.

[3] Seidensticker, p. 455, also points out that 1126-8 look like preparation for the scene.

[4] This is denied by Gredley, *GRBS* 9 (1968), 413, n. 8. He cites di Benedetto *ad loc.*, who however provides no examples of names like Πυλάδην being accommodated in iambics or trochaics by the substitution of two shorts for single short or anceps. (On this question in relation to iambics see *Eur. Alt.*, 97-8 and 102-3.) He also refers to A. M. Dale, but neither of the articles he cites proves to have any relevance to the metrical acceptability of 1535.

sure the Phrygian doesn't raise a cry of help to the Argives, but that he has no fear of Menelaus. The contrast makes sense, for if the Argives start attacking the palace, it's all over for Orestes since he has no purchase with them, but if Menelaus comes, he can deal with him. A message that brings Menelaus without the Argives is a useful message from Orestes' point of view. Now he mentions the two together and introduces the supposition with a γάρ that is puzzling: 'Let Menelaus come, long blond locks and all: *for* if he comes with Argives, he will see two corpses.'

Together (2) and (3) suggest we should adopt Seidensticker's deletion. On the other side is the sense that if Orestes' speech stops at 1532, the end is rather abrupt. Something like 1533-6 seems, on rhetorical grounds, to be wanted. Can these lines be reinterpreted (the contradiction with 1579-84 and with 1529-31) and emended (the metrical problem in 1535, the γάρ) so as to save them?

Let us begin with the γάρ. What the context leads us to expect is a δέ. The three cases Orestes considers are (a) arrival of the Argives (unwelcome), (b) arrival of Menelaus without Argive support (desirable), and (c) the possibility that Menelaus may arrive with Argives. If we connect (c) with the previous two by means of δέ γ' (Willink *per litteras*), Orestes says 'But if he brings Argives against this house and will not save my life,[1] I will still be able to avenge myself on him'. The metrical problem in 1535 disappears if we suppose that Πυλάδην is an interpolated proper name, Euripides having written φίλον (Weil). The claim that Menelaus will see his wife's corpse as well as his daughter's is more troubling, but given the rhetorical nature of the passage we may say that Orestes is speaking compendiously and means only that Menelaus will have lost both wife and daughter. For, mysterious as the disappearance of Helen was, Orestes will surely think, as did the Phrygian in 1500-2, that she is gone for good.

We must deal here with Willink's proposal (ad 1576-99) to delete 1579-84. He argues thus. (a) 1579 is 'a partial doublet of 1587'. (b) 1583 'ineptly abuses a convention of stichomythia ("timorous anticipation" interrupting, not a fear-arousing statement, but an angrily

[1] We should probably adopt Blaydes' conjecture σώσει θανεῖν (based on the minority reading of V) in 1534: the sentence begins as a 'minatory' future condition and should continue as one.

disbelieved "wish")'. (c) 'In these lines Or. is made to deny, not merely that he has "killed" Helen, but even that he has "cast her into Hades" . . . . [H]is plan requires him to encourage, not discourage, Men. in the belief that he has truly "killed" Helen, that Men. may take the more seriously the threat to kill Herm.'.

Before answering these objections to the lines I must note an objection to deleting them that is well-nigh fatal: deletion here would mean that Orestes' 1578 ('For your information, I intend to kill your daughter') would be followed by Menelaus' 1585 ('Give me back my wife's corpse for burial'), a highly improbable sequence.[1]

To (a) we may reply that deleting 1587-8 (Wilamowitz, praeeunte Wecklein) is a more economical way of dealing with the problem, though there is perhaps no need to delete either set of lines (see below). As for (c), I can't see that the distinction between 'killing' and 'casting into Hades' makes much difference since Orestes cannot claim *either* to have slit Helen's throat *or* to have caused her to disappear from the house: the latter wasn't his doing. And although we might wish that Orestes in this play acted more like a modern hostage taker, encouraging Menelaus to think he has already killed so that his threats would be taken more seriously, in the play we have he does not do so but instead is candid about his failure: see 1614, εἰ γὰρ τόδ' ἦν. On this line Willink says 'a clever ambiguity (another "cryptic" touch): Or. wishes that he himself had succeeded in cutting Helen's throat: but for Men.'s ear (if he is listening) Or. is referring rather to *Men.*'s failure to execute Helen when he recovered her from the Trojans (1286-7)'. I do not find plausible the suggestion that it is Menelaus' failure to kill Helen that is in view here: the point is too oblique, and 'brought her back as a victim for slaughter' does not apply to Menelaus' sight of his wife's breast, which took place in Troy. The most obvious interpretation here is the best one, that Orestes is disclaiming, as in 1579-84, that he has killed Helen. 1579-84 should stay: they are lively and in the best Euripidean manner and protected by 1614.

I'm inclined to believe, however, that there is force in (b). In 1580 Orestes denies killing Helen, claiming she was snatched out of his

[1] Willink says 'Men.'s reaction to the statement "I am going to kill your daughter" is (appropriately) to begin by demanding his wife's body for burial'. I do not find this response to an immediate threat appropriate.

grasp by the gods. (This agrees, of course, with the Phrygian's account in 1494-7, as well as with 1586.) In 1581 Menelaus asks whether Orestes denies killing her, and in 1582 he repeats his denial, saying that it pains him to admit his failure. The last part of his verse expresses an interrupted wish that he had done something. It is here that Willink detects a problem: there is nothing fear-arousing about Orestes' interrupted wish, so why should Menelaus say παρακαλεῖς γὰρ ἐς φόβον?

I'm not absolutely certain that Euripides didn't violate logic here for the sake of brevity or liveliness. But one way of meeting this objection would be to read ἐκ φόβου: Menelaus says that Orestes' interrupted wish invites him to hope for Helen's survival. But in the end he can't believe Orestes' denial.

To return, finally, to the 'partial doublet' argument, I must admit that, partial doublet or no, I am reluctant to delete 1587-8, which are crisp and neat in Euripides' best manner, as well spelling out the desire for revenge that is one of the motives for Orestes' attack on Hermione. Yet I cannot believe that Euripides repeated the phrase ἐπὶ φόνῳ πράσσεις φόνον at such a short interval. One way to save the lines would be to suppose that this phrase accidentally got copied as the end of 1587, obliterating Euripides' original wording, and that he originally wrote, e.g.,

Με. ὁ μητροφόντης συγγενεῖς κτείνεις ἀεί;
Ορ. ὁ πατρὸς ἀμύντωρ, ὃν σὺ προὔδωκας θανεῖν.

One result of this discussion of the distinctness of Menelaus and Argives in Orestes' calculations is to confirm my argument (see above on 696-716) that Menelaus did not exit by Eisodos B, toward the center of town and in the same direction as Tyndareus, but by Eisodos A by which he originally entered from Nauplia. In the present scene the Phrygian goes off by this same ramp, and Orestes can be satisfied that it is only to Menelaus that he will bring the word. Menelaus duly enters, and as expected he has with him his own attendants, not Argives (1561). It is only after he reaches an impasse with Orestes that he tries to summon Argive help.

In light of this contrast, we should consider the wording, interpretation, and staging of three further passages. (a) At 1510 D.'s text reads

Ορ. οὔτι που κραυγὴν ἔθηκας, Μενέλεων βοηδρομεῖν;

D.'s text adopts the minority reading Μενέλεων (five mss. and perhaps, but not certainly, the scholia) where the majority have the dative Μενέλεῳ. The dative is more likely to be correct, and it should probably be taken not with κραυγὴν ἔθηκας but as object of βοηδρομεῖν, the pause before it making this clear.[1] First, as 1529-30 make clear, Orestes is worried about the Argives, not about Menelaus. The κραυγή mentioned in 1529 is one directed to the Argives, and it is more economical to suppose that the same is true of this one as well. Indeed, raising a cry is normally done to rouse the citizens: cf. *Hcld.* 69-72, *Hip.* 776-7, 884, *Hec.* 1089-93. Second, the Phrygian's reply, σοὶ μὲν οὖν ἔγωγ' ἀμύνειν, using a parallel infinitive with dative object, makes a neat response to the majority text: 'Or. Did you raise a cry to come to Menelaus' aid? Phr. No, to come to your defense since you are worthier'. By contrast if Orestes says 'Did you raise a cry for Menelaus to come to the rescue', there is a slight awkwardness in the Phrygian's reply, 'No, [for people] to come to your aid'.

(b) After the departure of the Phrygian and Orestes the Chorus, who are in general sympathetic to Orestes and Electra, see events spiraling out of control into a new crisis (ἕτερον εἰς ἀγῶν'), and they briefly consider informing the Argives (1539-40). Seidensticker argued (p. 455) that these lines are incompatible with the Phrygian's having left the stage at the end of the tetrameter scene since they imply that Orestes has sent him indoors, not allowed him to spread the news abroad. But in fact they do make sense: the Chorus know that someone has gone down Eisodos A to alert Menelaus and suggest someone might be sent down Eisodos B, a suggestion they reject after a moment's thought as too dangerous (to themselves? to their friends?). The two destinations are distinct.

(c) In Menelaus' opening speech, 1554-65, D. deletes 1556-60 (del. Oeri) and 1564-6 (suspectos habuit Wecklein, del. Harberton).

---

[1] The verb is used with a dative object at *Rh.* 333. Cf. βοηθέω.

With the second of these deletions it is difficult to disagree: the passage is both clumsy and unnecessary. But the first, though not free of difficulty, is good enough in style to be genuine. The difficulties are as follows. (1) In 1556 the γάρ seems illogical: as Willink says, 'one does not logically expand the statement "I have come having heard (and evidently believing) . . ." by saying "*for* I have heard (incredibly) that . . ."'. (2) πολὺς γέλως seems odd on Menelaus' lips since he is not in a situation where laughter seems called for.

Willink says, 'Kirchhoff vainly proposed μὲν γάρ', but in fact μὲν γάρ is all that is needed to rescue sense here. 'I have come here because I have heard of the terrible and violent deeds of these twin lions: I do not call them "men". *To be sure*, what I have heard is that my wife has disappeared, not been killed. That was an idle tale, reported to me by someone confused by fear. In reality this is a piece of the matricide's trickery, and an absurd story it is.' Menelaus comes in having heard of Orestes' and Pylades' violent deeds. It is part of Euripides' design that he should believe in the danger to Hermione but disbelieve that his wife is still alive. This contributes to the surprise that everyone, including the audience, feels when Helen appears on the *mechane* with Apollo. It also contributes to the cross purposes we see in the conversation with Orestes: Menelaus asks for his wife's body, Orestes tells him to ask the gods for it. The audience needs to be told explicitly that although Menelaus has been informed of events in the palace by the Phrygian, he disbelieves a part of what he has heard. Kirchhoff's μὲν γάρ separates off part of the report for disbelief, and thereby prepares the way for the order in 1561-3 to storm the gates, 'so that I may at least rescue my daughter from these men's murderous hands'. (For the corruption, cf. 360 where some mss. omit μέν, and 694, where a sequence of particles is variously corrupted.) Nor need we insist that Menelaus is laughing: πολὺς γέλως merely explains that he finds the story of Helen's miraculous disappearance absurd. That is an entirely understandable attitude to take in the face of the report of supernatural events. We should not remove these lines and destroy the effect Euripides has created.

1616-8

Με. πέπονθα δεινά. Ορ. τότε γὰρ ἦσθ' ἀνωφελής.

Με. ἔχεις με. Ορ. σαυτὸν σύ γ' ἔλαβες κακὸς γεγώς.
ἀλλ' εἶ', ὕφαπτε δώματ', Ἠλέκτρα, τάδε, κτλ.

It is a long-standing puzzle why Orestes, having heard Menelaus capitulate, proceeds to give the order to fire the palace (though not to cut Hermione's throat). This makes a certain kind of sense if we think that Orestes is being portrayed as a sociopath, but that rather extreme view does not have many defenders today. One way of avoiding this contradiction is to say that Menelaus is not really capitulating and that ἔχεις με is complaint ('You've destroyed me), not capitulation, a view that receives some confirmation from Orestes' reply. Still, the most natural translation is 'You have me', i.e. 'I am in your power', and it may not be amiss to point out that Orestes' reply implies that Menelaus has said 'You have captured or destroyed me'. Good sense and easy corruption to the paradosis are given by εἶλές με.

BACCHAE[1]

20-4

ἐς τήνδε πρώτην ἦλθον Ἑλλήνων πόλιν,
τἀκεῖ χορεύσας καὶ καταστήσας ἐμὰς
τελετάς, ἵν' εἴην ἐμφανὴς δαίμων βροτοῖς.
πρώτας δὲ Θήβας τάσδε γῆς Ἑλληνίδος
ἀνωλόλυξα, κτλ.

20 πρώτην Chr. Pat. 1595 cod. A, coni. Cobet: πρῶτον LP et Chr. Pat. cod. C: πρῶτος Chr. Pat. codd. plerique πόλιν] χθόνα Chr. Pat., coni. Schenkl h.v. post 22 trai Pierson 21 τἀκεῖ Wilamowitz: κἀκεῖ LP 23 τασδε Π^3, coni. Pierson: τῆσδε LP

I accept most of the alterations D. has adopted here but take a different view of 20. In D.'s text 20 and 23 say the same thing, unnecessarily. Read ἐς τήνδε πρῶτον ἦλθον Ἑλλήνων χθόνα, the last word being the reading of Christus Patiens. Dionysus has described his progress through the world, and at 20 he arrives in Greece for the first time. Now τἀκεῖ contrasts Asia not with Thebes but with Greece at a whole. Only at 23 does he mention Thebes.

39-42

δεῖ γὰρ πόλιν τήνδ' ἐκμαθεῖν, κεἰ μὴ θέλει,
ἀτέλεστον οὖσαν τῶν ἐμῶν βακχευμάτων,
Σεμέλης τε μητρὸς ἀπολογήσασθαί μ' ὕπερ
φανέντα θνητοῖς δαίμον' ὃν τίκτει Διί.

V. Tammaro, *MCr* 18 (1983), 37-9, raises important objections to the usual ways of construing 39-40. Some, like Kirk, translate liter-

[1] I am grateful to Hugh Lloyd-Jones for criticisms of an earlier draft of this chapter. Reference will be made throughout to A. Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations on Euripides' Bacchae* (Amsterdam, 1991), as well as to the commentaries of E. R. Dodds[2] (Oxford, 1955) and R. Seaford (Warminster, 1996).

ally: 'For this land must learn to the full, even against its will, that it is uninitiated in my bacchic rites'. This is open to the objection that the city already knows that it is uninitiated, and the words 'even against its will' imply their being forced to do something more than this. By contrast, other translators, aware that a literal rendering is weak, import ideas into the Greek that are simply not there, as for example Roux, who translates 'la cité de Thèbes doit apprendre . . . *ce qu'il en coûte* de n'être pas initiée aux mystères dionysiaques' (emphasis added).[1] Tammaro himself proposes returning to the interpretation of Elmsley and Bruhn, taking ἀτέλεστον οὖσαν as a causal participle and supplying for ἐκμαθεῖν an object τὰ ἐμὰ βακχεύματα out of τῶν ἐμῶν βακχευμάτων: 'this city must learn to the full, even against its will, my bacchic rites, since it is uninitiated in them'. He cites K.-G. ii 560-3, Schwyzer-Debrunner ii 708-10, and Bruhn's Anhang § 26.

This could be right, but the examples are unreassuring. Bruhn cites no instance where an accusative is supplied out of a genitive. K.-G. cites one, X. *An.* 1.7.8, ὁ δὲ ἐμπιπλὰς ἁπάντων τὴν γνώμην ἀπέπεμπε (sc. αὐτούς). This seems a good deal easier brachylogy than the one postulated here. For one thing—and this is true of all the examples where the object for a main verb has to be supplied out of the object of a participle—the main verb comes after the participial phrase. A typical example is Thuc. 1.144, τούτοις ἀποκρινάμενοι ἀποπέμψωμεν (sc. αὐτούς).

But the sense Elmsley and Bruhn postulate is exactly right. Could we not achieve it by a slight alteration? Read

δεῖ γὰρ πόλιν τήνδ' ἐκμαθεῖν, κεἰ μὴ θέλει,
ἀτέλεστον οὖσαν, τἄμ' ὅμως βακχεύματα.

'This city, though uninitiated, must nevertheless learn my bacchic rites, even against its will.'[2]

---

[1] Dodds's paraphrase takes the same tack: 'The god implies that the Thebans must learn to the full, *suo cum malo*, what it means to neglect something profound and holy.'

[2] If Tammaro's point is valid that only weak sense is obtained by translating οὖσαν as participial indirect statement, as I think it is, we can rule out the interpretation of 41-2 given by Rijksbaron 11-2, who makes φανέντα a further participial indirect statement and construes ἀπολογήσασθαι as infinitive of purpose. A further reason to reject this is the infinitive of purpose is preceded by the main verb in the vast majority of the exam-

71-2

> τὰ νομισθέντα γὰρ αἰεὶ
> Διόνυσον ὑμνήσω.

Dodds says, 'αἰεί with νομισθέντα: cf. 201'. This has been challenged by Rijksbaron and Seaford, who claim that since Dionysus is a new god, it is inappropriate for the chorus to claim that they will hymn the god with songs that are 'always in use'. Rijksbaron claims that the position of αἰεί disfavors taking it with νομισθέντα (the adverb, he says, tends to stand between article and noun or noun-like constituent) and favors construal with ὑμνήσω. He also claims that the aorist νομισθέντα is ingressive and should be translated 'that have begun to be used'.

Dodds is right, and he could have cited another utterance of the chorus that parallels both the thought and the word-order of our present passage, 895-6: τό τ' ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ νόμιμον ἀεὶ φύσει τε πεφυκός. Here the same chorus are recommending adherence to 'that which over length of time is always lawful and grounded in nature'. The adverb clearly stands outside the article-noun group and just as clearly goes with it. Nor is νομισθέντα in the sense of νομιζόμενα without any parallel: see S. fr. 86. Lastly, it should be noted that taking αἰεί with ὑμνήσω produces something perilously close to nonsense ('Pay attention, you Thebans, for I shall *always* hymn Dionysus with the hymns that have just come into use'), whereas construing it with νομισθέντα means making perfect sense of the γάρ.

In my note on 197-209 I discuss the reasons why Euripides throughout the play adopts the contradictory position that Dionysus is a new god whose worship is age-old. That he has done so is clear from several passages besides 895-6 in which the chorus and others identify the worship of Dionysus with age-old custom: see 331, 387, 430, 995, and 1009-10.

---

ples in the grammars, and where it is not, it stands next to it. A. Tulin, *Mnemosyne* 47 (1994), 221-4, interprets ἐκμαθεῖν absolutely, supplying the notion 'that Dionysus is a god'. I do not find his argument convincing.

135-41

ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσσιν, ὅταν
ἐκ θιάσων δρομαίων
πέσῃ πεδόσε, νεβρίδος ἔχων
ἱερὸν ἐνδυτόν, ἀγρεύων
αἷμα τραγοκτόνον, ὠμοφάγον χάριν,
ἱέμενος εἰς ὄρεα Φρύγια Λύδι'
†ὁ δ' ἔξαρχος† Βρόμιος·
εὐοῖ.

135 ὄρεσσιν Elmsley: -σιν LP   ὅταν] ὃς ἂν Gompf: vide Henrichs, Mnemai: Class. Stud. K. K. Hulley (1984) 69-91   138 ἐνδυτὸν ἱερόν Diggle   141a ὁ δ' P: ὅδ' L

The Chorus here describe how (in the vivid imagination of his worshipers) the god himself accompanies the thiasoi of maenads on their hunt. One problem is how to make sense of all the verbs in this long sentence. In 135-9 the god is shown 'on the mountains', 'falling to the ground', 'wearing a holy garment of fawnskin', then 'hunting' for a goat to rend. All at once in 140 he is no longer on the mountains but 'rushing to the mountains of Phrygia, Lydia'. I do not think that all these verbs can coexist in one clause. I suggest that there may be two clauses here and that in one Dionysus is hunting on the mountains, while in the other he is rushing to the mountains: perhaps read ἱέμενός ⟨τ'⟩ ἐς ὄρη in 140 (hemiepes), the participle being parallel to the ὅταν-clause.

A further problem is the asyndetic Φρύγια Λύδι'. Deleting Φρύγια (Willink) gives good meter: Λύδι' ὅδ' ἔξαρχος Βρόμιος is 4da∧.

178-80

Κα. ὦ φίλταθ', ὡς σὴν γῆρυν ἠσθόμην κλυὼν
σοφὴν σοφοῦ παρ' ἀνδρός, ἐν δόμοισιν ὤν·
ἥκω δ' ἕτοιμος τήνδ' ἔχων σκευὴν θεοῦ·

Here is Dodds on 178:

> 'Dear friend—for I heard and recognized your voice.' ὡς is causal: 'rationem reddit cur carissimum appellaverit Tiresiam, priusquam viderit. Dicit enim haec, dum aperiuntur fores' (Hermann).

But there are several objections. First, Euripides has many instances where someone explains his choice of vocative, and in every case the causal word is γάρ. Second, such remarks are parenthetic, and the sentence continues without a connective after the interruption, as at *Hec.* 1114-5, quoted only partially by Dodds: ὦ φίλτατ', ᾐσθόμην γάρ, Ἀγάμεμνον, σέθεν φωνῆς ἀκούσας, εἰσορᾷς ἃ πάσχομεν; Our passage, by contrast, continues with a new clause introduced by δέ. Third, ὦ φίλτατ' *vel sim.* is frequently followed in Euripides by ὡς, and the ὡς is elsewhere always exclamatory: *Hip.* 1452, *Andr.* 802, *Hec.* 990, *Tro.* 1167, *Or.* 217, and also S. *El.* 23. Since ὡς must be exclamatory, and since Rijksbaron's attempt (28-30) to take it with σοφὴν seems strained, there is something to be said for Portus' ἡδόμην: 'Dearest friend, how glad I was to hear your speech, wise speech from a wise man, while I was still in the house. And I have come out wearing the god's livery.'[1] The imperfect, however, is not the expected tense, and we should adopt Elmsley's ἥσθημεν. For a list of cases where plural verb is modified by singular participle see Bond on *HF* 858. The corruption of ἥσθημεν to ᾐσθόμην, easy in itself, would have been made easier by the lack of grammatical agreement.

189-96

Τε. ταὔτ' ἐμοὶ πάσχεις ἄρα·
κἀγὼ γὰρ ἡβῶ κἀπιχειρήσω χοροῖς.
Κα. οὔκουν ὄχοισιν εἰς ὄρος περάσομεν;
Τε. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμοίως ἂν ὁ θεὸς τιμὴν ἔχοι.
Κα. γέρων γέροντα παιδαγωγήσω σ' ἐγώ;
Τε. ὁ θεὸς ἀμοχθεὶ κεῖσε νῷν ἡγήσεται.
Κα. μόνοι δὲ πόλεως Βακχίῳ χορεύσομεν;
Τε. μόνοι γὰρ εὖ φρονοῦμεν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι κακῶς.

---

[1] Portus' suggestion was made again by C. G. Cobet, *Variae Lectiones* (Leiden, 1883), p. 599.

191 οὔκουν Denniston: οὐκοῦν LP 193 interrogationis nota dist. Dobree; cf. Hcld. 729

D. correctly adopts Denniston's οὔκουν, but he should have punctuated declaratively (as at least in L), not interrogatively. The particle contains a 'therefore', and it is impossible to move without absurdity from Teiresias' 'I'm feeling like a young man myself' to Cadmus's 'Shall we not *therefore* go *by chariot* to the mountain?'. If Cadmus feels youthful, the only conclusion that suggests about the use of a vehicle is that they will *not* need a chariot. The next line is no refutation of this, for there is such a thing as assentient ἀλλά: see *IT* 754, *Hel.* 702, *IA* 647 (all stichomythic, as here), and Denniston, *GP* 16-21, especially (ii) (b) on pp. 18-9. The most obvious reason why the god would receive less honor if they used a chariot is that their rejuvenation is evidence of his power.

The persistence of the idea that 'Cadmus suggests taking a cab to Cithaeron' (Dodds's derisive phrase) has a lot to do with the notion, which little in the text supports, that Cadmus is somehow a reluctant or skeptical convert to the new religion, not a true believer but merely interested in the honor Dionysus' worship would bring to his family. It is true that 193 could be taken as evidence of incredulity and 195 of reluctance to be in a small minority, but if we punctuate 193 as a statement (and perhaps 195 as well), we get an interchange that suggests complete unanimity. 'Cad. No chariot then will take us to the mountains. Te. No, for then the god would be less honored. Cad. I, an old man, shall lead an old man like a child. Te. The god will bring us effortlessly there. Cad. We alone of the citizens shall dance in the god's honor. Te. Yes, we alone have sense, the others none.' Cadmus' following line, indicating that he is impatient to go, seems to confirm the reading suggested here, that these are two men with a single purpose. Recall that Cadmus was praised by Dionysus in the prologue (10-11) for his pious treatment of the god's birthplace. There is no suggestion here that Cadmus is other than sincere. Nor need we read skepticism into Cadmus' exhortation to Pentheus at 330-42. Just because he advises his grandson to pretend belief in Dionysus if he does not actually have it does not mean that he himself is pretending. And the last part of his advice, warning Pentheus

of the fate of Actaeon, certainly suggests that in his view Dionysus is a power capable of doing harm, i.e. a real god.

197-209

Κα. μακρὸν τὸ μέλλειν· ἀλλ' ἐμῆς ἔχου χερός.
Τε. ἰδού, ξύναπτε καὶ ξυνωρίζου χέρα.
[Κα. οὐ καταφρονῶ 'γὼ τῶν θεῶν θνητὸς γεγώς.
Τε. οὐδὲν σοφιζόμεσθα τοῖσι δαίμοσιν.
πατρίους παραδοχάς, ἅς θ' ὁμήλικας χρόνῳ
κεκτήμεθ', οὐδεὶς αὐτὰ καταβαλεῖ λόγος,
οὐδ' εἰ δι' ἄκρων τὸ σοφὸν ηὕρηται φρενῶν.]
Κα. ἐρεῖ τις ὡς τὸ γῆρας οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι,
μέλλων χορεύειν κρᾶτα κισσώσας ἐμόν;
Τε. οὐ γὰρ διῄρηχ' ὁ θεὸς οὔτε τὸν νέον
εἰ χρὴ χορεύειν οὔτε τὸν γεραίτερον,
ἀλλ' ἐξ ἁπάντων βούλεται τιμὰς ἔχειν
κοινάς, διαριθμῶν δ' οὐδέν' αὔξεσθαι θέλει.

199-203 del. Diggle (201-2 iam Collmann) 200 οὐδὲν LP: οὐδ' ἐν- Musgrave post h. v. lac. indic. Kirchhoff 201 πατρίους Valckenaer cl. Plut. mor. 756B: πατρὸς Π^{4}LP θ' del. Wecklein 202 καταβαλεῖ Scaliger: -βάλλει (Π^{5})L: -βάλλῃ P λόγοις Elmsley 204-5 Cadmo trib. Diggle: Tir. contin. Π^{4}L^{r}(P^{r})

The problems hereabouts are as follows. (1) The connection of 200 with 199 is weak, and the dative δαίμοσιν is hard to construe. Musgrave's οὐδ' ἐνσοφιζόμεσθα attempts to cure both these ills. (2) There is a harsh asyndeton in 201. (3) αὐτὰ in 202 is awkward coming so close on the heels of παραδοχάς: it is both otiose and the wrong gender. (4) (a) It may be thought odd that Teiresias, who at 272-97 argues rather sophistically about Dionysus, should disclaim such a practice in 200. (b) Also odd is the reference to 'ancestral traditions' when Dionysus is, as he admits, a new god. D.'s deletion of 199-203 deals out a rather summary justice for all four of these offenses. He nowhere indicates, however, why anyone should have interpolated the lines. Kopff's conjecture, that they have strayed in from Pentheus' speech (he puts them after 247) is unlikely to be

right. (5) There is another asyndeton in 204, which D. addresses by marking a change of speaker here and at 206.

Let us deal at once with (4). (a) There is a plain sense in which Teiresias can deny that he (ἐν)σοφίζεται τοῖς δαίμοσιν: to play the clever fellow in the realm of the gods might mean talking about them with sophistication, but it is more likely to mean denying their existence and refusing them worship. This denial and refusal is regarded elsewhere in the play as the essence of godlessness: see 321-5 (Pentheus is a θεομάχος because he won't honor Dionysus and laughs at his worship), 386-8, 517, 769-74 (the messenger recommends worshiping Dionysus in terms that remind one of Teiresias), 794-5, and especially 890-6, where belief in the gods is called a κούφα δαπάνα. There is no contradiction between 200 and 272-97.

(b) Throughout this play great pains are taken to suggest that, although Dionysus is a new divinity, his religion is old in itself: that is the point of 71-2, τὰ νομισθέντα γὰρ αἰεὶ Διόνυσον ὑμνήσω, and that is probably why his worship is blended with that of the Mountain Mother and the Corybantes; that is also the point of 890-6, where religion's antiquity is cited as grounds for thinking it authoritative. There is an obvious reason for Euripides to do this: Pentheus is to be an emblematic θεομάχος, not merely someone who is opposed to a particular new divinity. His situation is generalized so that it fits more nearly the situation of Euripides' audience. That is why no one in the play is made to say 'Old gods good, new ones bad'.[1] Pentheus, who could have been made a mere foe of innovation, is portrayed as impious *tout court*, and it is part of Euripides' strategy to have both Teiresias and the Chorus suggest that opposition to Dionysus is opposition to religion in general. No need, therefore, to deny these lines to Teiresias on the grounds of their sense. In fact, the evidence of this paragraph and the last make it virtually certain that they are part of Euripides' design. It is our duty to mend the lines, not delete them.

Kirchhoff marked a lacuna after 200. That is surely necessary if we are to save the lines in any plausible fashion, and mechanical lacunae of a line or two have clearly occurred elsewhere in the play.

---

[1] In 255-6 the point of Pentheus' reference to Dionysus as a new divnity is not that he rejects new divinities but that the cult of Dionysus will be just one more means for Teiresias to make a dishonest living. Pentheus takes a cynical view of all mantic activities.

Musgrave's οὐδ' ἐνσοφιζόμεσθα is also attractive. But there is force to Dodds's objection that in Teiresias' mouth 'the connective is hardly in place at this point, where he breaks off the stichomythia'. We could easily give both lines to Cadmus and then start Teiresias' speech with a single-line lacuna.[1] That allows us to start a new sentence at οὐδεὶς in 202, which means that καταβαλεῖ no longer has two unconnected objects (παραδοχάς and αὐτά). Euripides could have written something like this:

Κα. οὐ καταφρονῶ 'γὼ τῶν θεῶν θνητὸς γεγὼς
οὐδ' ἐνσοφιζόμεσθα τοῖσι δαίμοσιν.
Τε. ⟨οὐ γὰρ σοφοῦ πρὸς ἀνδρός ἐσθ' ὑπερφρονεῖν⟩
πατρίους παραδοχάς, ἅς θ' ὁμήλικας χρόνῳ
κεκτήμεθ'· οὐδεὶς αὐτὰ καταβαλεῖ λόγος,
οὐδ' εἰ δι' ἄκρων τὸ σοφὸν ηὕρηται φρενῶν.

(Wecklein's deletion of θ' in 201 would be a further improvement.) As for the rest, D.'s assignment of 204-5 is unnecessary. The asyndeton in 204 is perfectly in order when a speaker interrupts himself with a question. The γάρ in 206 is likewise quite in order: Teiresias answers his own question. I can find no expression like ἐρεῖ τις in speech-initial position but several examples in mid speech: see *Alc.* 954, *Hec.* 313, *Su.* 314, *Pho.* 580, *Or.* 665.

263-5

Χο. τῆς δυσσεβείας. ὦ ξέν', οὐκ αἰδῇ θεούς;
'Εχίονος δ' ὢν παῖς καταισχυνεῖς γένος 265
Κάδμον τε τὸν σπείραντα γηγενῆ στάχυν; 264

This is my text, with Musgrave's transposition. It is possible to take 'Cadmus, who sowed the crop of the Earthborn' as a second object of αἰδῇ, parallel to θεοὺς, but it makes a more natural pairing

[1] It is worth noting that almost all the speaker indications for this play were marked by L's and P's rubricators, and these men (or their predecessors) did not always do their job carefully, sometimes putting speaker changes in where they don't belong (e.g. 201, 510-8) and sometimes omitting them where they do (e.g. 189, 210, 591, 594, 596, 798, 802).

with γένος as a second object of καταισχυνεῖς. The force of the τε would be 'and in particular'.

294-7

χρόνῳ δέ νιν
βροτοὶ ῥαφῆναί φασιν ἐν μηρῷ Διός,
ὄνομα μεταστήσαντες, ὅτι θεᾷ θεὸς
Ἥρᾳ ποθ' ὡμήρευσε, συνθέντες λόγον.

Seaford's translation shows up clearly the awkwardness of the present text: 'And in time mortals say that he was stitched in the thigh of Zeus, having changed the word—because he was once hostage to Hera, a god to a goddess—and composed the story'. The sticking point is the part between the dashes. In 296 we cannot translate ὅτι as 'because' since men did not change the name or invent the story '*because* he was once hostage to Hera, a god to a goddess' but rather in spite of that fact.[1] It is more plausible to translate the ὅτι-clause '*that* he once was hostage to Hera', and to take it as explicating λόγον. It follows that we must dagger συνθέντες: we need a word that will mean that men changed the name because they 'forgot' or 'misunderstood' or 'confused' the story that Dionysus had once been Hera's hostage. Good sense is given by συγχέοντες, but the synizesis is impossible. We should probably write (ὡμήρευσ') ἀσυνετοῦντες. The word seems prosy, but its poetic pedigree is guaranteed by its occurrence, in the Aeolic form ἀσυννέτημι, in a famous poem of Alcaeus (fr. 326 L.-P.).

242-7: see *CQ* 41 (1991), 340.

302-5: see *CQ* 41 (1991), 341.

[1] Rijksbaron 51 translates 'In time men say he had been sewn in the thigh of Zeus, after they had changed (or: by changing) the word, having constructed the story because he, a god, had been hostage to a goddess'. He explains that Dionysus had been a hostage, and that 'therefore people constructed a story (viz. to explain away this fact)'. 'To explain away the fact that' is a lot to read out of ὅτι.

312-21

τὸν θεὸν δ’ ἐς γῆν δέχου
καὶ σπένδε καὶ βάκχευε καὶ στέφου κάρα.
οὐχ ὁ Διόνυσος σωφρονεῖν ἀναγκάσει
γυναῖκας ἐς τὴν Κύπριν, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῇ φύσει
[τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἔνεστιν ἐς τὰ πάντ’ ἀεί]
τοῦτο· σκοπεῖν χρή· καὶ γὰρ ἐν βακχεύμασιν
οὖσ’ ἥ γε σώφρων οὐ διαφθαρήσεται.
ὁρᾷς, σὺ χαίρεις, ὅταν ἐφεστῶσιν πύλαις
πολλοί, τὸ Πενθέως δ’ ὄνομα μεγαλύνῃ πόλις·
κἀκεῖνος, οἶμαι, τέρπεται τιμώμενος.

One could consider deleting 314-8. The asyndeton in 314 is certainly suspicious, and 319-20 joins up nicely with 312-3: ‘receive Dionysus, make libation to him, join the ecstatic dance, crown your head: he rejoices at being honored the same as you do’. Furthermore, the lines seem clumsy. When the god has been accused of making women unchaste, it is off the point to say that he does not force them to be chaste. We could have expected ‘He does not force them to be unchaste, for that lies in their nature’.

But there is too much about the lines that seems genuine. Wilamowitz suggested marking a lacuna before 314, which would both make the transitions more explicit and eliminate the unwanted asyndeton. And since Pentheus has twice mentioned female unchastity (217-25, 260-2), it is appropriate for Teiresias to take up this point. Before 314, therefore, read something like ⟨ἃ δ’ ἐς γυναῖκας εἶπες οὐ φροντιστέον·⟩, after which 314 is perfectly in order. As for the awkwardness of σωφρονεῖν in Teiresias’ argument, there is some evidence that another word once stood there: the second hand of P and Stobaeus have μὴ σωφρονεῖν. Musgrave’s μὴ φρονεῖν might be the truth or perhaps παραφρονεῖν.

325-7

κοὐ θεομαχήσω σῶν λόγων πεισθεὶς ὕπο.
μαίνῃ γὰρ ὡς ἄλγιστα, κοὔτε φαρμάκοις
ἄκη λάβοις ἂν οὔτ’ ἄνευ τούτων νόσου.

327 νόσου Dobree: νοσεῖς LP

D. prints Dobree's νόσου in 327. The conjecture is ingenious, but I do not think it gives the sense we require. It makes Teiresias say Pentheus will never be cured of his madness, either by means of drugs or without their aid. Teiresias is a prophet, of course, and what he says happens to come true, but he explicitly disclaims (368-9) that he is speaking by his mantic art, and it is hard to see why he is so sure (the imperatives in 312-3 seem to imply the possibility of his worshiping Dionysus) and why he should use this emphatic form of denial (the exhaustive dichotomy 'with drugs / without drugs'). By contrast the transmitted reading makes two points, that no drug will cure Pentheus' madness and that some drug (i.e. rationalistic skepticism) has caused it.

333-6

κεὶ μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος, ὡς σὺ φῄς,
παρὰ σοὶ λεγέσθω· καὶ καταψεύδου καλῶς
ὡς ἔστι Σεμέλης, ἵνα δοκῇ θεὸν τεκεῖν
ἡμῖν τε τιμὴ παντὶ τῷ γένει προσῇ.

335 Σεμέλη θ' Tyrwhitt, vix recte

Here by contrast D. adopts the paradosis, which gives the wrong sense, and refuses a conjecture that puts it right and whose corruption into the paradosis is easily explained. Cadmus cannot be urging Pentheus to say of Dionysus that 'he is Semele's son' but simply that he exists, is real. This is followed by two purpose clauses, 'both so that Semele may be thought to have given birth to a god and so that honor may attach to our whole family'. A round letter like theta or omicron is always in danger of being taken for the half-round lunate sigma.

346-54

στειχέτω τις ὡς τάχος,
ἐλθὼν δὲ θάκους τοῦδ' ἵν' οἰωνοσκοπεῖ

μοχλοῖς τριαίνου κἀνάτρεψον ἔμπαλιν,
ἄνω κάτω τὰ πάντα συγχέας ὁμοῦ,
καὶ στέμματ' ἀνέμοις καὶ θυέλλαισιν μέθες·
μάλιστα γάρ νιν δήξομαι δράσας τάδε.
οἱ δ' ἀνὰ πόλιν στείχοντες ἐξιχνεύσατε
τὸν θηλύμορφον ξένον, ὃς ἐσφέρει νόσον
καινὴν γυναιξὶ καὶ λέχη λυμαίνεται.

Seaford, pp. 148-9 of his commentary, says that we cannot know how the two eisodoi were used because there are parts of the city of Thebes lying in either direction (Pentheus goes through the city on his way to Cithaeron). As in *Orestes*, however (see on *Or*. 67-8, 696-716, and 1524-36), so here it is possible to be pretty certain how the two were used. Both lead through Thebes, but one (Eisodos A) leads to Teiresias' house and is the 'local' eisodos *par excellence*, while the other (Eisodos B) leads through the other side of the city to foreign locations and Mt. Cithaeron. In the above passage twice Pentheus sends his servants off on errands. It is reasonable to suppose that the two parties go in separate directions. The man who is to destroy Teiresias' place of augury will use Eisodos A, the eisodos Teiresias used when he arrived to meet Cadmus. The men who are to hunt down Dionysus go down the Cithaeron eisodos (Eisodos B), just as Dionysus had when he exited at 63. We are to imagine that he had not yet left the city for Cithaeron but was engaged in freeing the Theban bacchants held in prison when he surrendered. This escape from prison is mentioned by the Servant who enters at 434, and we can conclude that the prison lies in that same direction. (The prison has no further function in the play, since Dionysus is imprisoned not there but in the royal stables, entered by way of the door of the *skene*.)

395-401

τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία,
τό τε μὴ θνατὰ φρονεῖν
βραχὺς αἰών· ἐπὶ τούτῳ
δὲ τίς ἂν μεγάλα διώκων
τὰ παρόντ' οὐχὶ φέροι; μαι-

νομένων οἵδε τρόποι καὶ
κακοβούλων παρ' ἔμοιγε φωτῶν.

396-7 ita dist. Aldina (cf. IT 1121-2); post φρονεῖν Brodaeus 398 δὲ τίς ἂν μεγάλα Tyrwhitt: δέ τις ἂν μ- Tr (δέ τις ἂν in ras.) et Stob.: δέ τις ἂν τὰ μ- <L?>P 399 φέροι Tyrwhitt: -ει LP et Stob. τὰ παρόντα φέρειν sic fere dictum ut Su. 124 εὐτυχοῦντες . . . φέρειν (sc. εὐτυχίαν); cf. fr. 1077

D.'s text differs from Murray's in two respects: (1) with the Aldine edition he joins βραχὺς αἰών with what precedes, and (2) he turns the next sentence into a question by making transmitted τις oxytone. I will argue that D.'s version, despite superficial attractions, is inferior to Murray's.

(1) If we adopt the Aldine punctuation, the first sentence means 'Cleverness is not wisdom, and failure to think mortal thoughts is (spells) a short life'. The parallel at *IT* 1121-2 where an infinitive is set equal to βαρὺς αἰών is *prima facie* impressive. One thing, however, tips the balance slightly in favor of punctuating after φρονεῖν with Brodaeus. βραχὺς αἰών could mean either 'a shorter life than necessary', i.e. premature death, or 'life is short', i.e. mortals do not naturally live a long time. With D.'s punctuation the unwisdom of cleverness consists in the fact that the clever man dies an untimely death, but the rest of the passage is about consequences of unwisdom that are of a less palpable kind (see (2) below), failure to enjoy life's present satisfactions. It seems to me slightly preferable to see τὸ μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν as an paraphrase (with τε explicative) of τὸ σοφόν: 'Cleverness, i.e. thinking thoughts too high for mortals, is not wisdom'.

(2) Murray's text of the rest gives the following excellent sense: 'Life is short: this being so a man who pursues great things may miss what lies at hand. To live thus is to be, in my judgment, a madman and a fool'. The subject is not wicked men being sent to an untimely death but rather the folly of missing what life has to offer. This is of a piece with other utterances of the chorus, who repeatedly stress that worship of Dionysus means enjoyment of the ordinary pleasures of mortal life, pleasures that fools, including clever thinkers, deprive themselves of: see, e.g., 73-7, 379-85, 389-92, and 911-2. The senti-

ment, that striving for what is distant may mean missing what lies near at hand, is Pindaric and is exemplified by *Pythian* 3.20-3:

> ἤρατο τῶν ἀπεόντων [sc. Coronis]· οἷα καὶ πολλοὶ πάθον.
> ἔστι δὲ φῦλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισι ματαιότατον,
> ὅστις αἰσχύνων ἐπιχώρια παπταίνει τὰ πόρσω,
> μεταμώνια θηρεύων ἀκράντοις ἐλπίσιν.

In a similar vein Seaford cites *Isthmian* 7.42-8. Dionysiac religion is portrayed here and throughout as traditional good sense based on a realistic understanding of the nature of human life. Life is short, and ordinary daily enjoyment, not extraordinary clever thinking, is the sure route to happiness.

D.'s text, with interrogative τίς, could be construed in two ways, both inferior to the above. In his app. crit. he compares *Su.* 124, which suggests the translation 'In view of this, what man, pursuing great things, would be unable to endure what is present?' This makes no argument that I can understand. If we ignore the explanation in the app. crit. we might translate 'In view of this, what man would pursue great things and not win what is close at hand?'. This is slightly better. But the rhetorical question implies that no one would do this, whereas the words that immediately follow imply, as does the whole discussion, that the world in fact contains such foolishly clever people. Both Dodds and Seaford say that word order favors τίς, since ἄν likes a position behind the interrogative, but for ἄν following the indefinite pronoun see *Hcld.* 460 and *Hel.* 759.

810-9

Δι. ἆ.
βούλῃ σφ' ἐν ὄρεσι συγκαθημένας ἰδεῖν;
Πε. μάλιστα, μυρίον γε δοὺς χρυσοῦ σταθμόν.
Δι. τί δ' εἰς ἔρωτα τοῦδε πέπτωκας μέγαν;
Πε. λυπρῶς νιν εἰσίδοιμ' ἂν ἐξῳνωμένας.
Δι. ὅμως δ' ἴδοις ἂν ἡδέως ἅ σοι πικρά;
Πε. σάφ' ἴσθι, σιγῇ γ' ὑπ' ἐλάταις καθήμενος.
Δι. ἀλλ' ἐξιχνεύσουσίν σε, κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ.
Πε. ἀλλ' ἐμφανῶς· καλῶς γὰρ ἐξεῖπας τάδε.

Δι. ἄγωμεν οὖν σε κἀπιχειρήσεις ὁδῷ;
Πε. ἄγ' ὡς τάχιστα, τοῦ χρόνου δέ σοι φθονῶ.

813 τί δ'; Musgrave 814 νιν] μὲν Bruhn 817 ἔλθῃς Pierson: θέλῃς P 818 τόδε Hermann

This is a crucial passage for interpretation, and one of the most puzzling in the play. The biggest question is why Pentheus abandons his decision to call out the army against the maenads and decides to visit them alone, and why he entrusts himself to the guidance of someone he has hitherto regarded as his adversary. A prevalent view is that Pentheus wishes to see the women, his mother among them, having sex. I hope to show that there is considerable evidence against this idea. But before we can address this question, there are several smaller questions about the conduct of the dialogue that must at least be raised.

Dionysus asks Pentheus if he would like to see the maenads sitting together on the mountains, and Pentheus replies that he would give much gold to do so. Dionysus expresses surprise at this, and Pentheus replies 'It would grieve me to see them drunk'. So far from explaining, this merely puzzles further, as Dionysus' next question shows: 'Would you enjoy looking at what gives you pain?' Pentheus' next reply is no more lucid than his earlier one: 'Most certainly I would, sitting quietly under the fir trees'. Two puzzling replies, therefore. But the first, as Dionysus' follow-up question shows, is supposed to be puzzling, in the way individual lines sometimes are in stichomythia. Whether or not we adopt Bruhn's μὲν for νιν, the sense seems to be 'To be sure, it would give me pain to see them drunk'.

It is thus with the second answer that the real difficulties begin. Why does Pentheus not explain how it is that, though it would grieve him to see the women drunk, he nevertheless wants to see them? And why shift (καθήμενος) from their behavior to his own? The usual view is that σιγῇ γ' ὑπ' ἐλάταις καθήμενος expresses Pentheus' desire to watch the women without being seen and is evidence of his voyeurism. There are several objections to this. First, σιγῇ is not the same as κρύφιος and does not by itself convey the idea of stealth. Second, ὑπ' ἐλάταις means 'beneath (the shade of) the fir trees', not

'concealed by the fir trees'. Third, elsewhere in the play the phrase 'sitting under the fir trees' *vel sim.* is used of the maenads: see 38 and 684. In view of this, we might suspect that J. S. Reid's suggestion, καθημένας for καθήμενος, may be right.[1] To supplement his earlier statement that it would grieve him to see the women drunk he replies, 'Yes, I would like to see them, [not drunk but] sitting in silence under the fir trees', just as the messenger had described them. Even if we retain the reading of P, the sense will be that Pentheus wants to sit quietly under the shade of the fir trees like one of the bacchants. I will discuss below the light this throws on Pentheus' motivation.

The next couplet looks *prima facie* like the refutation of Reid's conjecture.[2] Dionysus objects 'But they will hunt you out even if you go in secret', and κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ looks like an allusion to σιγῇ ... καθήμενος, interpreted as 'sitting unobserved'. But defenders of the paradosis ought to feel some embarrassment at the nonsensical nature of 817-8, for Pentheus' reply, 'So I must go openly: this suggestion of yours is a good one', makes no sense. It would be nonsensical, if you tell me 'You will not be admitted to the ball even if you wear evening dress', to reply 'So I must wear blue jeans: this suggestion of yours is a good one'. 'Even if' implies that if he goes openly, it is more likely, not less, that he will be hunted down. We are entitled to suspect that κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ, which makes no sense, is corrupt. And in fact ἔλθῃς is Pierson's conjecture for θέλῃς.

How can we achieve logical and dramatic sense here? Let us assume that σε κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ is wrong and that Euripides wrote either σ' ἐὰν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ (Elmsley[3]) or σ' ἐὰν θέλῃς λαθεῖν (Reiske). Either gives the sense 'But they will hunt you out of your hiding place if you try to conceal yourself'. Dionysus, having planted in Pentheus' mind the notion that he should see for himself what the maenads are doing before attacking them, is trying to get him to agree further that he should go 'openly', that is, not trying to conceal himself in the underbrush. Only if we get rid of the καὶ in 817 does

[1] The suggestion was made to J. E. Sandys and recorded in the app. crit. of his edition of *Bacchae* (3rd. ed., London, 1892).

[2] Sandys, after citing Reid, says 'sed adversatur κἂν (817)'.

[3] LSJ say that ἐάν has a long second syllable, and they cite passages from Sophocles and Aristophanes. As it happens, Euripides has no instance of ἐάν before a vowel, and I strongly suspect that ἐάν γ' is what he wrote. The emphasis imparted by the particle to the 'if' is welcome if Dionysus wants Pentheus to conclude that going openly is best.

the line make that suggestion. Once Pentheus accepts this, Dionysus causes him to take the next logical step (note νυν in 821), that he must dress as a woman to avoid being killed as a male interloper.

Just why Pentheus puts himself at the mercy of the Stranger is left inexplicit, and there is some plausibility in the view that with his interjection ἆ in 810 Dionysus exerts some kind of coercive power over his adversary. But interpreters have usually thought that Dionysus has an ally in Pentheus' breast. A common view is that Pentheus gives in to Dionysus' suggestion because he wants to see the Theban women having sex. Now it is true that Pentheus first enters voicing suspicions that the new religion is a pretence for sexual license, a view he holds, in spite of Cadmus' reassurances, to the end of the scene (cf. 353-4) and into the next (cf. 485-8). But thereafter the theme is dropped until it is possibly touched on fleetingly at 1060-2. (I discuss 957-8 below.) There is nothing explicitly pointing at voyeurism in the present passage. Dionysus entices Pentheus with the sight of the women *sitting together*. Neither the verb nor its prefix suggests that they are having sex with men. And, come to think of it, why should Euripides have caused Pentheus to be defeated because of a weakness for voyeurism? Such a malady would be thematically irrelevant: being a θεομάχος has no necessary relation to suffering from skopophilia. We should not think of Pentheus as the victim of submerged sexual desires, for ever since his interview with the captive Dionysus another powerful—and much more relevant—motive has come into play. In their first conversation it is obvious that Pentheus is fascinated by the religion he claims to disbelieve in. He wants to know the nature of the rites (471), the kind of bliss they confer (473), and the nature of the god who attends them (477). The fact that the rites are secret acts as a powerful incitement to his curiosity (475). In the present scene as well Pentheus' fascination with the details of cultic dress becomes apparent (830, 832, 834). This continues when he emerges from the *skene* to be led off. There is no hint of sexual interest here, the only *prima facie* exception being 957-8, discussed below. Instead he says a great deal about looking like a proper bacchant (925-6, 937-8), learning the steps of the dance (941-2), and entering the ecstatic state so fully that he can lift Mt. Cithaeron on his shoulders (945-6). Pentheus, in Hartung's phrase, has a *libidinosa spectandorum secretorum cupido*. But the *secreta* in ques-

tion are those not of sex but of religion. Pentheus has been told that the new religion offers its devotees bliss, and although he wants to disbelieve, part of him suspects that the claim is true.

859-61

γνώσεται δὲ τὸν Διὸς
Διόνυσον, ὡς πέφυκεν ἐν μέρει θεὸς
δεινότατος, ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἠπιώτατος.

860 μέρει Diggle: τέλει P

P's ἐν τέλει gives the wrong sense, for Dionysus is not εἷς τῶν ἐν τέλει, one of those in authority. D.'s ἐν μέρει gives better sense: Dionysus is 'by turns' most terrible and to mortals most kindly, or, taking ἀνθρώποις as ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, by turns most terrible and most kindly to mortals. But H. Hirtzel's ἐντελής also gives good sense at lower cost: 'He will learn that the son of Zeus is in the full sense a god, most dreadful but to mortals most kindly'. By 'mortals' is not meant all human beings without exception but those who act in a manner that befits their mortality. The word ἄνθρωπος in prose often has overtones of 'a (poor) creature', and perhaps it is not necessary to take it ἀπὸ κοινοῦ.

877-81=897-901

†τί τὸ σοφόν, ἢ τί τὸ κάλλιον†
παρὰ θεῶν γέρας ἐν βροτοῖς
ἢ χεῖρ' ὑπὲρ κορυφᾶς
τῶν ἐχθρῶν κρείσσω κατέχειν;
ὅτι καλὸν φίλον αἰεί.

877 nec de sensu nec de numeris constat ἢ τί τὸ] ἦ τι Willink olim (τὸ iam del. Paley)

In the first printing of the Loeb I adopted Willink's conjecture, published in *CQ* 16 (1966), 229-31 but now retracted by him (see his comment on *Or*. 831-3). I translated 'What good is cleverness? Is

there any god-given privilege nobler in the sight of men than to hold one's hand in triumph over the heads of foes? What is noble is always loved'. I am now persuaded that neither the conjecture nor D.'s obeli are necessary. I still believe, however, that my translation, though it has to be changed to reflect interrogative τί, is correct on two essential points, (1) that τὸ σοφόν is not 'wisdom' but 'cleverness', and (2) that the Chorus's point is that victory over one's enemies, the fairest guerdon the gods afford, is the natural result not of cleverness but of piety. I translate thus: 'What good is cleverness? Or what, pray tell, is the privilege given by the gods that is nobler among men than to hold one's hand in triumph over the heads of foes? What is noble is always loved.'

(1) In every place in the play where it occurs, τὸ σοφόν is a pejorative expression, '[mere] cleverness', and its overtones are, at best, 'idle speculation' and at worst 'intellectually based rejection of religion and morality': see 203, 395, and 1005, the last of which, though the text is corrupt, clearly has nothing very favorable to say about τὸ σοφόν. The expression is absent from the other extant plays, but the unmistakable tone of immoral cleverness can be heard in fr. 583, from *Palamedes*: ὅστις λέγει μὲν εὖ, τὰ δ' ἔργ' ἐφ' οἷς λέγει αἴσχρ' ἐστί, τούτου τὸ σοφὸν οὐκ αἰνῶ ποτέ. That being so, it seems rash to translate 'What is wisdom?' (Dodds). Rather it must be 'What good is cleverness?'[1]

(2) Thereafter the Chorus ask rhetorically whether any privilege the gods grant is superior to triumphing over one's enemies. The implication is that godless cleverness will not result in the realization of this desirable goal. The Chorus believe that in the long run the impious are doomed and that the pious will see and exult over their downfall.

By contrast Seaford puts a question-mark after βροτοῖς and starts a new sentence with ἦ (Blake) χεῖρ'. This gives the following sense: 'Is it [the finest gift from the gods] to hold the hand in triumph over

---

[1] M. Cropp, 'ΤΙ ΤΟ ΣΟΦΟΝ?' *BICS* 28 (1981), 39-41, denies that its meaning is pejorative here and elsewhere in the play. He translates 395 'wisdom is not wisdom', and calls it 'a genuine paradox'. He goes on to say 'But it is no paradox to actually say "rationalistic pseudo-wisdom is not wisdom"'. But there is no reason to prefer self-contradiction when the text admits a non-contradictory interpretation. There is plenty of point (paradox of a less extreme kind) in saying (I paraphrase to render the word-play) 'being a wise guy is not wisdom'.

the heads of your enemies [as Pentheus proposes to do]? No, for what is fine is *always* loved.' This is implausible, for doing good to friends and harm to enemies is one of the cornerstones of Greek morality, a duty recognized by all but a few intellectuals like Socrates. Had the Chorus rejected popular morality, they would surely have had to explain why, not merely assumed that it was wrong. And it would then be inconsistent for them to speak of revenge in such glowing terms in the following stasimon (992-6). Furthermore ὅ τι καλὸν φίλον αἰεί is a traditional sentiment, and it makes little sense to use it so obliquely to justify thought that is utterly untraditional, by putting unnatural emphasis on 'always' ('What is noble is *always* dear [unlike doing down your enemies]'). There is no contradiction between the desire to see the enemy of their god punished (and to exult at his punishment) and the emphasis in the epode on the quieter aspects of the Dionysiac life.

The transmitted text is correct, and neither Willink's ἦ τι for ἢ τί nor Paley's deletion of τὸ is necessary or desirable. As for the first, the ἢ can be retained as a way of replacing or restating the original question 'What does cleverness amount to?'. By contrast, ἦ would be unidiomatic, as Rijksbaron points out.[1] It is desirable to retain the τὸ: as Dale shows, keeping it gives better meter.[2] The sense, though slightly more difficult, is subtly better, and the article, as Cropp suggests, sounds a note of challenge to the Chorus's imaginary interlocutor to produce something finer than triumph over one's enemies.[3] I have attempted to render this nuance in the translation above by 'pray tell'.

---

[1] A. Rijksbaron, *Grammatical Observations on Euripides' Bacchae* (Amsterdam, 1991), pp. 109-12: 'Normally, ἦ-questions which follow a τί- or other *x*-question simply present a suggested answer, e.g. *Andr.* 1062: ποίαν περαίνων ἐλπίδ'; ἦ γῆμαι θέλων;' That is, they are surmise-questions. That is not the case here.

[2] See A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 148-9, who calls 877 a blunt enneasyllable and cites *Hip.* 525, Ἔρως Ἔρως ὁ κατ' ὀμμάτων. See also M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), p. 66, n. 80.

[3] Cropp cites *HF* 151, τί δὴ τὸ σεμνὸν σῷ κατείργασται πόσει, 'where Lycus challenges Megara to produce the example which, he implies, Megara needs in order to sustain her case'.

890-6: see *CQ* 41 (1991), 341-4.

953-60

Πε. καλῶς ἔλεξας· οὐ σθένει νικητέον
γυναῖκας· ⟨ὑπ'⟩ ἐλάταις δ' ἐμὸν κρύψω δέμας.
Δι. κρύψῃ σὺ κρύψιν ἥν σε κρυφθῆναι χρεών,
ἐλθόντα δόλιον μαινάδων κατάσκοπον.
Πε. καὶ μὴν δοκῶ σφας ἐν λόχμαις ὄρνιθας ὣς
λέκτρων ἔχεσθαι φιλτάτοις ἐν ἕρκεσιν.
Δι. οὔκουν ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἀποστέλλῃ φύλαξ;
λήψῃ δ' ἴσως σφας, ἢν σὺ μὴ ληφθῇς πάρος.

954 ⟨ὑπ'⟩ ἐλάταις (cf. 816) Diggle (vel ⟨ἐν⟩): ἐλάταισι P: -σιν Barnes

Dodds, like other commentators, rightly takes ἔχεσθαι as passive, not middle, and λέκτρων as dependent on ἕρκεσιν, not as the object of ἔχεσθαι. But since he thinks that Pentheus is a voyeur he translates 'Think of it! I fancy they are in the bushes now, like mating birds, hugged close in the grip of love'. Here are three gratuitous references to sex, corresponding to nothing in the text, 'mating', 'hugged close', and 'in the grip of love'. There is no justification for speaking of 'mating' birds. And 'hugged close' is a tendentious translation of ἔχεσθαι, 'are held'. As for 'the grip of love' the overtones of ἕρκος are 'defense, protection', not 'grip', and φιλτάτοις has no necessary connection with sexual love.[1] Instead, the lines mean 'Indeed, I imagine that like birds (nesting) in bushes[2] they are held fast in the sweet enclosures of their beds'. The First Messenger had described the maenads asleep (683-8), and it is this picture that Pentheus' words evoke. Nothing in the text shows him imagining the maenads making love.

In 954 Diggle's ⟨ὑπ'⟩ ἐλάταις is both unnecessary and unwanted. As noted above in my comment on 816, ὑπ' ἐλάταις is used in expressions that describe sitting under the boughs of fir trees, not con-

---

[1] Seaford's translation is similar.

[2] For postpositive ὣς going with a whole phrase see *Andr.* 538, *HF* 72, 869, and *Or.* 45.

cealing oneself behind them. That will be true of 816 whether we accept the paradosis or adopt J. S. Reid's conjecture. What is wanted here is a simple dative of means, as at 722. Caesura after the sixth element is of course common when there is an elision at that point.

1002-4

> †γνώμαν σώφρονα θάνατος ἀπροφάσιστος
> εἰς τὰ θεῶν ἔφυ
> βροτείω τ' ἔχειν ἄλυπος βίος.

In D.'s text the daggers extend to 1007, but since I adopt the remedy for 1005 cited in his apparatus and have nothing independent to say of the problem in 1006, I cite only these lines. Many scholars have seen that though the strophe is corrupt, the meter we require here is 2δ δ 2δ. Dodds wrote γνωμᾶν σωφρόνισμα θάνατος, and he realized that what follows is a new thought requiring ⟨δ'⟩ before εἰς. Murray for his part realized that βροτείω conceals βροτείως. The τ' implies that we need another adverb, parallel to βροτείως and likewise dependent on ἔχειν, the whole phrase meaning something that can be set equal to 'a life without pain'. The prosaic word ἀπροφάσιστος is corrupt both in stem and in ending. I suggest that Euripides wrote ἀόκνως:

> γνωμᾶν σωφρόνισμα θάνατος· ἀόκνως ⟨δ'⟩
> ἐς τὰ θεῶν ἔφυ
> βροτείως τ' ἔχειν ἄλυπος βίος.

The sense is 'Death is the chastener of his purposes: <but> to be unhesitating toward the gods and act like a mortal means a life without pain'.

1035-6

> Αγ. Θῆβας δ' ἀνάνδρους ὧδ' ἄγεις ⟨ x — υ —
> x — υ — x — υ — x — υ — ⟩;

1036 lac. unius metri indic. Brunck, versus alterius Seidler

There is a parallel at S. *El.* 1081 (lyr.) for ὧδε modifying a word that stands in front of it, but when we look for examples in Euripides, they are not fully convincing. In my discussion of *Or.* 1 I give reasons for thinking that ὧδ' (if not a corruption of ὡς) goes with what follows. At *Pho.* 1620 we have τί μ' ἄρδην ὧδ' ἀποκτείνεις, Κρέων, but the author of these lines is almostly certainly not Euripides. In light of this, the word-order in this passage looks rather lonely, and we might do well to consider the possibility of marking a lacuna of four metra after ἀνάνδρους. Clearly the scribe was being rather careless here to make such a strange omission, and perhaps we need not assume any of the usual causes. But a *saute du même au même* might have been caused by some such text as the following:

> Θῆβας δ' **ἀνάνδρους** ⟨**ὦ** γύναι, τεθνηκότος
> δοκεῖς ἄνακτος; ἐς **ἀνίαρά σ'** ⟩ **ὧδ'** ἄγεις.

'Do you think, woman, that Thebes has no men now that our king is dead? That is the way to bring yourself into misery.' Now ἀνάνδρους means 'without men'. When it appeared to be modified by ὧδε, it would more likely have meant 'unmanly, effeminate'.

1070-2

> Πενθέα δ' ἱδρύσας ἐλατίνων ὄζων ἔπι
> ὀρθὸν μεθίει διὰ χερῶν βλάστημ' ἄνω
> ἀτρέμα, φυλάσσων μὴ ἀναχαιτίσειέ νιν, κτλ.

1071 μεθιεις Π^7

Translation is a bit awkward here: 'Having settled Pentheus on the fir boughs, he *released the tree upward through his hands so as to be straight*, taking care that he not unseat him'. The papyrus suggests that P may be corrupt. Read ὤρθου μεθιεὶς: 'he proceeded to set the tree straight again by letting the branches slip upwards through his hands'. This would be an example of an inchoative imperfect.

1181-4

Χο. τίς ἄλλα; Αγ. τὰ Κάδμου . . .
Χο. τί Κάδμου; Αγ. γένεθλα
μετ' ἐμὲ μετ' ἐμὲ τοῦδ' ἔθιγε θηρός· εὐ-
τυχής γ' ἅδ' ἄγρα.

ἀντ.

μέτεχέ νυν θοίνας. Χο. τί μέτεχω, τλᾶμον;

1183a-b εὐτυχής γ' ἅδ' Nauck: εὐτυχεῖς τᾷδ' P post h.v. duos chori trimetros excidisse coni. Schoene

Nauck's conjecture may be unnecessary. Transmitted εὐτυχεῖς τᾷδ' ἄγρᾳ could be regarded as agreeing in sense with γένεθλα: Cadmus' daughters are 'blessed in this hunt'.

Murray adopts the lacuna postulated by Schoene and Wilamowitz, two trimeters to correspond with 1200-1. Dodds objects that it is unnecessary since 1200-1 need not be in responsion but could be the beginning of the iambic scene. Yet in an *amoibaion* it is normal to have speaker change when a new stanza begins. Plausible parallels for stanza-end without change of speaker are rare: in Euripides I find only *Su.* 1145 and *Tro.* 591. In the first Collard, following Grégoire, assigns 1144 and 1151 to the Chorus. In the second the transmitted speaker indications are impossibly asymmetrical, and I have adopted those of Willink, which eliminate the absence of speaker-change at stanza boundary and at the same time give more plausible sense. It is likely that Schoene and Wilamowitz are right in the present passage and that some such couplet as the following stood before 1184:

⟨Χο. εὐδαιμονίζω σ', ὦ γύναι, καὶ συγγόνους,
ἄγρας τυχούσας τιμιωτάτης μακρῷ.⟩

I have also adopted Willink's (as yet unpublished) μέτεχ', ὦ for μετέχω. It is idiomatic to ask for explanation by repeating your interlocutor's word preceded by τί (see Diggle, *Studies* 51). Furthermore 'What do you mean, "partake"?' gives better sense than 'Why should I partake?' Seaford on *Cy.* 368-71 distinguishes between ὦ τλῆμον 'O suffering one' and τλῆμον 'Shameless or reckless one', and he

cites this passage for the latter meaning. But the chorus do not elsewhere express moral disapproval of Agave, and they pity her at 1200. 'Poor deluded creature' is exactly what one would expect here.

1240-7: see *CQ* 41 (1991), 344-5.

1371

Κα. στεῖχέ νυν, ὦ παῖ, τὸν Ἀρισταίου
⟨ ⟩.

Cadmus's speech is clearly lacunose, and Hermann marked a lacuna as above. But filling it is rather awkward, and he did not make the attempt. The sense we look for is that Agave should go to the place where Actaeon met his fate, and it is ever so much easier to produce this meaning by putting the lacuna mid-line thus:

στεῖχέ νυν, ⟨οὗ παῖδ' ὤλεσεν ἴλη
σκυλάκων,⟩ ὦ παῖ, τὸν Ἀρισταίου.

The scribe's eye would have leapt from οὗ παῖδ' to ὦ παῖ, causing the omission.

IPHIGENIA AULIDENSIS

Iphigenia Aulidensis presents special problems. The play was apparently left unfinished at Euripides' death. We are told in ancient sources (see *Euripidea*, TT 40 and 2.12) that the poet's son or nephew, Euripides the Younger, put it on posthumously, probably in 405, and it is reasonable to suspect that he either completed the play or hired someone else to do so. But further additions were made by later hands. The grand entrance of Clytaemestra and Iphigenia at 590ff. seems to come from the fourth century, and there are many other passages, some quite extensive, where later interference has reasonably been suspected. Lastly, the messenger speech at the end contains lines (1578-1629) apparently written at the very end of antiquity, when both classical prosody and the metrical patterns of tragic verse were no longer understood.[1] As a result of this, there are in this play far more lines whose authenticity has been challenged than in any other extant tragedy.

My Loeb edition has as its goal to reconstruct what the first audience heard, the joint product of Euripides and Euripides the Younger, and to bracket off everything later. (The OCT edition, by contrast, tries to identify only what is genuine Euripides.) In doing this I am helped by a discovery about the plot that allows us to isolate quite a number of passages as the work of a single fourth-century interpolator, whom I call the Reviser. In my Loeb introduction to the play I give a brief summary of the arguments I use to identify the Reviser's work, and in an article called 'Toward a Reconstruction of *Iphigenia Aulidensis*', forthcoming in *JHS* 123 (2003), I set out the case in detail. To the Reviser I assign 1-48, 106-63, 335-441, 454-9, 465-6, 469-537, 590-630, 919-43, 955-69, 975-1007, 1017-21, 1148-84, 1241-52, 1407-30, and 1447-52. I mark as spurious, without being able to assign them to the Reviser, 633-7, 640-1, 681-94, 721-6, 749-50, 773-83, 946, 973-4, 1032, 1098-1105, 1114-9, 1124-8, 1130-3, 1276-82, 1369-70, 1435-9, 1458-61, 1475-1509, 1530, and 1532-1629.

---

[1] M. L. West, *BICS* 28 (1981), 73-8, discusses this ending and concludes that it is not Byzantine, as often maintained, but somewhere between the 4th to 7th centuries A.D.

The notes that follow mostly leave the question of authenticity to one side. Interpolations, like genuine text, are subject to corruption, and one can hope to restore both kinds of material to the form in which their author wrote them.

1-16

ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ
Ὦ πρέσβυ, δόμων τῶνδε πάροιθεν
στεῖχε.
ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΗΣ
στείχω. τί δὲ καινουργεῖς,
Ἀγάμεμνον ἄναξ; Αγ. σπεῦδε. Πρ. σπεύδω.
μάλα τοι γῆρας τοὐμὸν ἄυπνον
καὶ ἐπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς ὀξὺ πάρεστιν.
Αγ. τίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀστὴρ ὅδε πορθμεύει
σείριος ἐγγὺς τῆς ἑπταπόρου
Πλειάδος ᾄσσων ἔτι μεσσήρης;
οὔκουν φθόγγος γ' οὔτ' ὀρνίθων
οὔτε θαλάσσης· σιγαὶ δ' ἀνέμων
τόνδε κατ' Εὔριπον ἔχουσιν.
Πρ. τί δὲ σὺ σκηνῆς ἐκτὸς ἀίσσεις,
Ἀγάμεμνον ἄναξ;
ἔτι δ' ἡσυχία τήνδε κατ' Αὖλιν
καὶ ἀκίνητοι φυλακαὶ τειχέων.
στείχωμεν ἔσω.

7-8 Agamemnoni contin. Bremi cl. Theon. Smyrn. de astr. 16 (p. 147 Hiller) (τί ποτ' . . . σείριος;): Seni trib. L

I attribute these lines to the Reviser, but that is no reason not to get text and interpretation as correct as we can. There are a number of interlocking problems in 6-11. (1) How are the lines to be divided between the two speakers? (2) What is the ἀστὴρ σείριος (Σείριος)? The Dog Star? A planet, as Theon of Smyrna claims? Or some other star, such as Aldebaran (alpha Tauri)? (3) Why does Agamemnon, having told the Old Man to hurry out of the tent, then launch into a leisurely discussion of the heavens without any relevance to the ur-

gent matter of his letter to Clytaemestra? What does the identity of the star in question have to do with the rest of what he says?

(1) The division in L gives 7-8 as a reply to Agamemnon's question, whereas the quotation in Theon of Smyrna makes one sentence of 6-8. D. adopts Theon's division, correctly: the words ἐγγὺς . . . μεσσήρης, describing the position of the star being asked about, clearly do not belong in the answer but in the question.

(2) With L's text (τίς) and Theon's division we must write σείριος with lower-case initial, otherwise Agamemnon would be answering his question in the act of asking it. We therefore have to ask what celestial body is being talked about. Housman, *CR* 28 (1914), 267 [=*Classical Papers* 2.886], declared that it was part of a general's business to know the fixed stars, that Agamemnon could not have asked his question about one of these, and that therefore Theon of Smyrna was right when he claimed that ἀστήρ here is being used of a planet. We shall examine Housman's planet argument below, but in any case we have an unidentified celestial body. We may keep Sirius if we accept, as Willink does,[1] the text (lightly adapted) of Theon's quotation—τί ποτ' ἆρ' ἀστὴρ ὅδε πορθμεύει Σείριος, 'What in the world is Sirius, still high in the sky, bringing us?'

(3) There is no way to decide this without seeing how Agamemnon's question fits with the passage as a whole, with both what precedes and what follows: why, after hurrying the servant out of the tent, does he ask his astronomical question, unrelated to the business at hand, and why does he continue with a comment on the stillness of the night? We can compare our two candidates on this point. If we adopt D.'s text, the point of 9-11 appears to be the stillness of the night: there are none of the sounds, such as bird-song and the breezes accompanying a change of temperature, that betoken the dawn. The force of οὔκουν . . . γ' ('Well, at any rate, there's no sign of, etc.') is to retract the preceding question as no longer necessary, which suggests that it is a question about the time of night: 'What is that twinkling star? Never mind, dawn is clearly still some time off'. This suggests that the anonymous ἀστήρ is indeed a fixed star, for only such a star could have provided Agamemnon with any indication of the time of night. Agamemnon asks his question distractedly but then

[1] *CQ* 21 (1971), 350-2.

withdraws it as unnecessary. There seems to be no connection with the business at hand, at least none that is explicitly made.[1] It seems to be an indirect way of beginning a difficult conversation, as Matthiae suggests: 'cum homines de re aliqua cum alio colloqui volunt, ad quam tractandam inviti accedunt, anxie anquirere, unde dicendi initium sumant, saepe etiam a levioribus incipere solent'.

Willink's adaptation of Theon's text gives a different thought sequence: 'What is baleful Sirius bringing us? Well, at any rate, there is no wind on the Euripus (and hence no relief from the dilemma of Iphigenia's sacrifice).' This is barely possible (Agamemnon would be speaking intelligibly to himself but not to the servant), but at this point the audience will not understand the significance of the lack of wind, and therefore the dramaturgy whereby a speaker says things that are mostly opaque to his dialogue partner seems out of place.[2] The poet has also obscured Willink's point by mentioning the silence of the birds. My best guess is that D.'s text is right, that Agamemnon's distracted question is a way of leading up to the business at hand, and that the silence of everything is a way of indicating the time of night.

Scholars have objected to Sirius on the grounds that it is an astronomical blunder to place it 'near' the Pleiades, and so it is an advantage to eliminate Sirius. The σείριος ἀστήρ that stands nearest the Pleiades is Aldebaran or alpha Tauri.[3] If we make this identification and take μεσσήρης to mean 'on the meridian', that would put the date sometime in early August, well within the sailing season.

---

[1] Page, *AI* 132 thinks the time of night is important since once dawn comes Iphigenia may appear at any moment. But nothing in the text itself suggests this.

[2] There is also no reason to think that the Greeks were kept in Aulis by *lack* of wind rather than contrary winds. Zielinski, who thought they were, pointed out that windlessness was a Sophoclean innovation, adopted for particular purposes in *Electra* but without any justification here: see *Tragodumenon Libri Tres* (Cracow, 1925), p. 274, n. 1. Certainly windlessness cannot be proved by 813, where μένω 'πὶ λεπταῖς ταισίδ' Εὐρίπου πνοαῖς cannot mean 'I stay in Aulis because of a lack of wind'. Markland's emendation ῥοαῖς, adopted by D., is almost certainly right.

[3] See J. E. Harry, 'The Bright Aldebaran', *CR* 28 (1914), 190-1, to which Housman's article is a reply.

71-3

ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκ Φρυγῶν ὁ τὰς θεὰς
κρίνας ὅδ', ὡς ὁ μῦθος ἀνθρώπων ἔχει,
Λακεδαίμον', κτλ.

72 Clem. Alex. paed. 3.2.13.1 ὁ Tr[1] et Clem.: om. L
'Αργείων Clement

In 72 ὁ is a supplement by Triclinius, and since it also appears in Clement's text D. adopts it. But two things give pause. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 637 showed that an anarthrous adnominal genitive only rarely stands outside the article and noun group. This suggests that ὁ μῦθος ἀνθρώπων should be viewed with suspicion. A second point is that in expressions like 'as men say' or 'as it is said' λόγος or μῦθος customarily lacks an article: cf. *Su.* 655, *IT* 532, 534, *Pho.* 396, A. *Su.* 230, S. *Ant.* 829, Theocr. 15.107. It is at least worth suggesting a different supplement for L: ὡς ⟨μὲν⟩ μῦθος ἀνθρώπων ἔχει. The same particle occurs at *Su.* 655.

356-7

κἀμὲ παρεκάλεις· Τί δράσω; τίνα ⟨δὲ⟩ πόρον εὕρω πόθεν;
ὥστε μὴ στερέντα σ' ἀρχῆς ἀπολέσαι καλὸν κλέος;

356 ⟨δὲ⟩ Tr[3] πόρον ⟨δ'⟩ Matthiae

A. M. Dale, *Glotta* 37 (1958), 102-5, sets out the rules for resolution in the trochaic tetrameter. The first of these is as follows: 'Where the second long of a trochaic metron is resolved, the three syllables forming the second half of metron are contained within the same word. Exceptions are confined to the first metron of the line.' She notes that Triclinius' version of 356 contains an exception in that πόρον εὔ- are three syllables making up the second half of the metron but are divided between two words. She recommends Matthiae's τίνα πόρον ⟨δ'⟩ both for this reason and because two resolutions in the same metron are found elsewhere only with proper names.

Even though there is reason to think that a great deal of what L presents us with hereabouts is not by Euripides, it still seems worthwhile to try to deal with both this line and the next together. The sense I intuit is this: 'You repeatedly asked for my help: "What am I to do, what means can I find so that I may not be deprived of my command and lose my noble reputation?"'. Perhaps what Euripides or his adaptor wrote was this:

τίνα ποθ' εὕρωμεν πόρον
ὥστε μὴ στερέντες ἀρχῆς ἀπολέσαι καλὸν κλέος;

D., by contrast, sets the question-mark at the end of 356. This makes the ὥστε-clause a rather clumsy continuation of παρακαλεῖς: the accusative σ' after the second-person verb is unexplained (Musgrave proposed στερέντας). But the alteration here proposed is a somewhat violent, and perhaps this couplet should be left as transmitted to bear witness against the genuineness of the whole passage.

573-6

†ἔμολες, ὦ Πάρις, ᾗτε σύ γε†
βουκόλος ἀργενναῖς ἐτράφης
Ἰδαίαις παρὰ μόσχοις,
βάρβαρα συρίζων, Φρυγίων κτλ.

ἔμολες is clearly unsound since Paris' *going* to the place where he was raised as a cowherd is not to the point. But ᾇτε . . . ἐτράφης could easily mean 'the manner of your being raised', i.e. the kind of education you had. This would make a contrast with the kind of moral education that had been the subject of the previous stanza. Excellent sense, following closely on the Chorus's claim that good education makes the city great, would be δεῖξεν for ἔμολες: 'the proof is the manner of your being raised as a cowherd: see what harm that wrought!' (For the locution see *Andr.* 496.) But the corruption is not easily explained, and I suggest instead a looser connection ἔμαθον or ἔκλυον: 'I have been told how you were raised', with the connection to what precedes left implicit.

1185-6

εἶεν·
θύσεις †δὲ παῖδ' ἔνθα† τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς;
τί σοι κατεύξῃ τἀγαθόν, σφάζων τέκνον;

1185 δὲ ⟨δὴ⟩ L. Dindorf (vide Denniston, GP 259)

L. Dindorf's conjecture is unlikely to be right. εἶεν is never in Euripides followed by δέ. (There is one instance in Sophocles, *OC* 476.) It seems better to suppose that both δὲ and ἔνθα are clumsy attempt to fill out a line rendered too short by the mechanical omission of a syllable and the failure to see that εἶεν is *intra metrum*. Read Nauck's εἶεν· ⟨σὺ⟩ θύσεις παῖδα. τίνας εὐχὰς ἐρεῖς; I argue in *JHS* that this is the third line of Clytaemestra's speech and comes directly after 1146-7.

1378-82

εἰς ἔμ' Ἑλλὰς ἡ μεγίστη πᾶσα νῦν ἀποβλέπει,
κἀν ἐμοὶ πορθμός τε ναῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν κατασκαφαὶ
τάς τε μελλούσας γυναῖκας, ἤν τι δρῶσι βάρβαροι,
μηκέθ' ἁρπάζειν ἐᾶν †τὰς† ὀλβίας ἐξ Ἑλλάδος,
τὸν Ἑλένης τείσαντας ὄλεθρον, ἣν ἀνήρπασεν Πάρις.

1380-1 τάς τε μελλούσας γυναῖκας μηκεθ' ἁρπάζειν ἐᾶν ceteris deletis Congington τάς γε . . . μή τι . . . , del. 1381, tum 1382 τείσαντες Günther (μή et τίσαντες iam Weil, 1381-2 iam del. Wecklein) 1381 ἐᾶν τάσδ' Porson, ἐᾶν τούσδ' Monk, ἐᾶν σφας Diggle, ἑαυτοῖς Jackson 1382 ἀνήρπασεν Vitelli: ἥρπ- L

There may be no perfect solution to the problems of 1380-2, but on balance a combination of Günther's version of 1380 and Wecklein's deletion of 1381-2 solves most problems and is probably open to the fewest objections. Conington's conflation of 1380 and 1381 eliminates ὀλβίας ἐξ Ἑλλάδος, and to that extent it is good. We do not want here a reference to Greece's wealth, especially since Greece contrasts with Troy, a byword of Oriental luxury all throughout tragedy. Rhetorically, too, 'rich Hellas' is not well suited to exciting

the indignation Iphigenia's argument requires. But there is nothing obviously wrong with τι δρῶσι βάρβαροι, and furthermore no obvious motive for anyone to supplement Conington's verse to produce the two verses we find in L. By contrast, Günther's τάς γε μελλούσας γυναῖκας μή τι δρῶσι βάρβαροι could easily have been corrupted to the reading of L, and once that happened, there would be a motive to produce 1381. One would like to save 1382 if possible, but ὄλεθρος is a strange word to use of Helen's abduction, and ἣν ἀνήρπασεν Πάρις is disagreeably otiose. The supplementer, having set to work, decided to give full measure, pressed down and shaken together.

15-19

Χο. φύλακες στρατιᾶς. Εκ. τί φέρῃ θορύβῳ;
[Χο. θάρσει. Εκ. θαρσῶ.
†μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν; Χο. οὐκ ἔστι. Εκ. τί σὺ γὰρ†
φυλακὰς προλιπὼν κινεῖς στρατιάν,]
εἰ μή τιν' ἔχων νυκτηγορίαν;

16-18 del. Diggle (post 15 fort. lac. indicanda est propter hiatum) 17 [Χο. οὐκ ἔστι. Εκ.] τί Dindorf, Χο. οὐκ ἔσθ', ⟨Ἕκτορ⟩. Εκ. τί Jackson 18=37b-38a

D.'s deletion of 16-18 has little to recommend it. (1) 16 is both blameless and lively in the manner of the play's author; (2) 17 is too long but contains a plausible phrase at the beginning (μῶν τις λόχος ἐκ νυκτῶν) and an indispensable phrase at the end (τί σὺ γὰρ leads right into 18, which looks genuine here); and (3) the deletion forces us to suppose that a verse has fallen out after 15 (hiatus within an anapestic system occurs only at speaker change; the only exception being S. *OC* 188). Dindorf's deletion avoids all these inconveniences and leaves us something that can easily be translated: 'Cho. Have no fear! Hec. Not I! Is there some night raid? Why have you left your guard post and thrown the army into confusion if you have nothing to report by night?'

The last phrase could be sharpened a bit if we wrote εἰ μή τιν' ἐρῶν νυκτηγρεσίαν, 'unless to announce some stirring in the night'. The word νυκτηγρεσία is rare, but like its more prosaic counterpart νυκτεγερσία it is used to describe the night activities of *Iliad* 10: cf. Σ Hipponax 118 B 6 W., Strabo 9.5.18, and Hypothesis (c) to *Rhesus*. It is clear from its metrical lengthening that the word had currency in dactylic poetry and could have been borrowed from there by the *Rhesus* poet.

451-3

ὑμῶν δὲ μή τις ἀσπίδ' ἄρηται χερί·
ἐγὼ γὰρ †ἕξω† τοὺς μέγ' αὐχοῦντας δορὶ
πέρσας Ἀχαιούς, καίπερ ὕστερος μολών.

452 ἔγωγ' ἀρήξω Kirchhoff 452-3 ἥκω . . . πέρσων Nauck, ἀρκῶ (Holzner) . . . πορθεῖν vel ἐξαρκέσω γὰρ . . . πέρσας Diggle hos vv. del. Herwerden

D. has daggered the right word, but none of the suggestions reported in his apparatus carries absolute conviction, and most involve quite a bit of change. As it is, the change of a single letter gives excellent sense: read ἥξω, 'I shall come back having plundered the boastful Achaeans with my spear, latecomer though I am'.

467-73

Ρη. τοιαῦτα μέν σοι τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας
πρᾶξαι παρέξω· σὺν δ' Ἀδραστείᾳ λέγω.
ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν ἐχθρῶν τήνδ' ἐλευθέραν πόλιν
θῶμεν θεοῖσί τ' ἀκροθίνι' ἐξέλῃς,
ξὺν σοὶ στρατεύειν γῆν ἐπ' Ἀργείων θέλω
καὶ πᾶσαν ἐλθὼν Ἑλλάδ' ἐκπέρσαι δορί,
ὡς ἂν μάθωσιν ἐν μέρει πάσχειν κακῶς.

468 πρᾶξαι παρέξω suspecta (lac. post 467 indic. Kovacs) 469 ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν Morstadt: ἐπειδὰν ΟΛ: ἐπειδ' ἂν δ' V: cf. A. ScT 734

Let me take this opportunity to make in print the arguments that persuaded D. that something might be wrong here. First, πρᾶξαι παρέξω seems to mean 'I will allow you to exact', and its object would appear to be τοιαῦτα. But 'I will allow you to exact such things' is hard to make sense of, especially since in his immediately preceding lines 451-3 he forbids the Trojans to do anything to the Greeks and promises he will do it alone. Furthermore, τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας has no obvious construction. I suggested to D. *per litteras* that something had fallen out after 467, something that would explain

the genitive and perhaps also specify the noun to go with τοιαῦτα, and that τοιαῦτα looks forward. I suggest, e.g.,

> τοιαῦτα μέν σοι τῆς μακρᾶς ἀπουσίας
> ⟨ᾗ δυσχεραίνεις, ἄξι' ὠφελήματα⟩
> πρᾶξαι παρέξω· σὺν δ' Ἀδραστείᾳ λέγω·

'I shall allow you to exact from me <a benefit that befits> my long absence, <at which you take offense> and it is this (may Adrasteia not resent my words)'. Now πρᾶξαι makes sense since it refers to an exaction of war service against Greece described in 469-70. This has the further advantage that we can now dispense with (indeed, must positively refuse) Morstadt's ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν: we require asyndeton or γάρ here, not δέ. The collocation ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν is not attested in Euripides or Sophocles, and *Sept.* 734 is the only example in Aeschylus. By contrast there are a few instances in tragedy of ἐπειδάν. None of these stands with the last syllable in a short element, and we should agree with LSJ, who say that the -αν is probably long, which leaves open the possibility that it is short, as it is in ὅταν. If the author of the *Rhesus* treated it as long, he doubtless wrote ἐπεὶ γὰρ.

634-7

> Αθ. οὐκ ἂν δύναιο τοῦ πεπρωμένου πλέον·
> τοῦτον δὲ πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς οὐ θέμις θανεῖν.
> ἀλλ' ᾧπερ ἥκεις μορσίμους φέρων σφαγὰς
> τάχυν'· ἐγὼ δὲ τῷδε σύμμαχος Κύπρις
> δοκοῦσ' ἀρωγὸς ἐν πόνοις παραστατεῖν, κτλ.

636 ᾧπερ P²: ὥσπερ Ω

Athena is dissuading Diomedes from making an attack on Alexandros, not fated to succeed, in favor of one on Rhesus, which is favored by fate. It is just possible to translate D.'s text at 636-7: 'But hasten on your way (to him) for whom you have arrived bringing fated slaughter'. The person fated to die at Diomedes' hand is Rhesus. But the reference to Diomedes' *past* arrival, bringing fated slaughter, is less than fully perspicuous: his arrival at Troy is a long

time ago, and his arrival at the tent of Rhesus still lies in the future. Read ἥξεις and clarity is improved: 'But hasten (to the man) to whom you will arrive bringing fated slaughter'. Some slight tightening would be achieved by reading οἷπερ: 'But hasten to the place where you will arrive bringing fated slaughter'.

910-4

ἅ θ' Ἕλλανα λιποῦσα δόμον
Φρυγίων λεχέων ἔπλευσε πλαθεῖσ',
†ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ ὤλεσε† μὲν σ' ἕκατι Τροίας,
φίλτατε, μυριάδας τε πόλεις
ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐκένωσεν.

910 Ἕλλανα Badham: ἑλένα Ω   912 ἃ διώλεσε Jackson, ἀπὸ δ' ὤλεσε Henning (ἀπό τ' Wecklein), ὅπου ὤλεσε Wilamowitz   σ' ἕκατι Bruhn: σε κατὰ Ω

The Muse's words continue her initial ὄλοιτο by adding another name to her curse list, that of Helen, 'who having left her Greek home sailed, having drawn near to a Phrygian bed'. This somewhat inelegant phrase, with its confusing participles, will call for comment below. Meanwhile in the next line we are faced with daggers and suggestions. Jackson's gives good sense: 'a Phrygian bed, which destroyed you for Troy's sake, dear son', though his explanation for the origin of ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ is rather labored. Wilamowitz' conjecture is better, giving perfect sense and an easy explanation of the paradosis: ὅπου, referring to a Troy that had to be understood out of Φρυγίων, was difficult enough for someone that he added an explanatory note, which in time effaced the ὅπου.

I have alluded above to the oddity that the participle πλαθεῖσ' stands in a confusing relation to the main verb ἔπλευσ' as well as to the preceding λιποῦσα. We could call πλαθεῖσ' a coincident aorist participle and put the relation to λιποῦσα down to inelegant writing. But there is additionally a metrical problem. The meter of 911 (~900) is T (variant of telesillean) plus bacchius. It is a recognized principle that catalexis (e.g. a bacchius) followed by short or anceps means period end, and that is what we have here. But period end is incompati-

ble with elision, and the last syllable of πλαθεῖσα is elided. We can fix this easily enough by writing πλέουσ' ἐπλάθη: 'a curse on her as well who having left her Greek home drew near on ship to a Phrygian bed'.

ADDENDUM: CYCLOPS

60-2

εἰς αὐλὰν πότ' ἀμφιλαφῆ
ποιηροὺς λιποῦσα νομοὺς
Αἰτναίων εἴσει σκοπέλων;

60 ἀμφιλαφῆ Hartung: ἀμφιβαλεῖς Tr: ἀμφιβαίνεις L 62 εἴσει Seidler: εἴσω L

Above is the text and apparatus I printed in 1994. S. L. Slings in his review of my *Euripidea*[1] takes issue with 'the grassy meadows of Aetna's crags' and claims that transmitted εἴσω is needed to govern the genitive. But the genitive with ποιηροὺς νομοὺς is perfectly in order and indicates that these meadows 'belong to' Aetna's crags in much the same way as one says Μαραθῶν τῆς 'Αττικῆς. As I noted in *Euripidea* there is a slight hyperbaton: εἴσει stands just inside the limits of the participial phrase. For similar hyperbata see *Ion* 1069-72 and *Ba*. 530-2, cited in *Euripidea*, and *Il*. 16.511-2, 11.326-7, 9.567, S. fr. 562 R., λιποῦσα μὲν / Νηρηίδων ὤρουσα πόντιον χορόν, all quoted in Stinton, '*Agamemnon* 1127 and the Limits of Hyperbaton', *PCPS* 21 (1975), 83-5 (=*CPGT* 100-2).

Slings also objects to my translating Αἰτναίων σκοπέλων as 'of Aetna'. I accept this criticism and in the second printing I now translate the phrase 'of Aetna's crags'.

342-4

ξένια δὲ λήψῃ τοιάδ', ὡς ἄμεμπτος ὦ,
πῦρ καὶ πατρῷον ἅλα λέβητά θ', ὃς ζέσας
σὴν σάρκα δυσφάρωτον ἀμφέξει καλῶς.

343 post Nauck (λίβα) ἅλα Kovacs: τόνδε L: τόδε Hermann θ' Nauck: γ' L 344 δυσφάρωτον Barnes: δυσφόρητον L

[1] *Mnemosyne* 50 (1997), 103.

This is again my own text. Slings[1] says that I do not 'see the humour' of L's πατρῷον τόνδε λέβητα γ' (or Jackson's χαλκόν γ'). The humor is supposed to lie in the fact that 'the Cyclops calls his boiling pot a family heirloom'. There is a subjective element here in that different people find different things funny. I can only say that to me the joke seems weak. It also seems out of character since the Cyclops does not elsewhere show signs of the sort of vanity or snobbery Slings detects. And in this context a menacing rather than a fatuous Cyclops seems to be called for.

We leave subjectivity behind when we ask the question whether τόνδε (or Hermann's τόδε) can be correct. I argued that since the implement was not on stage and had not been mentioned before, the demonstrative cannot be correct.[2] Slings offers no counter-evidence. Until such is produced, suspicions like Nauck's and mine seem fully justified. Slings also says that 'salt' is expressed in Attic by the plural ἅλες, which is true enough for prose. For the singular in Attic poetry see Ar. *Ach.* 835 and the other examples from the comic poets cited in LSJ s.v.

370-1

νηλής, τλᾶμον, ὅστε δωμάτων
ἐφεστίους ἱκτῆρας ἐκθύει ξένους, κτλ.

370 τλᾶμον Wecklein: ὦ τλᾶμον L   ὅστε Kovacs: ὅστις L

Slings says that in my text, given above, I 'gratuitously' change transmitted ὅστις. But I proposed the alteration because the line doesn't scan. The first line of the strophe, which corresponds with 370, scans as sp lk, and in lyric iambics long ancipitia are rare and are avoided before a word break preceding the final cretic (Porson's law). Slings says nothing about this issue, one highly relevant to the question whether the text is sound.

---

[1] See last note.

[2] Mastronarde, *BMCR* 5.4 (1994), 329, asks '[W]hy should there not be a large cauldron on stage (for ghoulish display) to which τόνδε in 343 refers?' But why should the Cyclops possess both an outdoor cauldron and an indoor one (392, 399, 404)? The notion that indoor objects are duplicated outdoors 'for ghoulish display' does not seem at all likely.

His criticism of my solution is better founded, and I am grateful to him for pointing out that ὅστε clauses are properly adjectival. Here the clause is causal, and the sense and meter we require are best given by an equally simple change, ὅς γε, which I adopt in my second printing.

ADDENDUM: ALCESTIS

673-6

Χο. νεικῶν—ἅλις γὰρ ἡ παροῦσα συμφορά—
παῦσαι, πατρὸς δὲ μὴ παροξύνῃς φρένας.
Φε. ὦ παῖ, τίν' αὐχεῖς, πότερα Λυδὸν ἢ Φρύγα
κακοῖς ἐλαύνειν ἀργυρώνητον σέθεν;

673 νεικῶν post Haley ("Αδμηθ') Kovacs: παύσασθ' C 674 παῦσαι Hayley: ὦ παῖ C

This is my text, which I defend at *Euripidea* 163-5. But Mastronarde, *BMCR* 5.4 (1994), 329, says, 'In other cases of parenthetic γάρ-clauses interrupting a sentence, the word before the interruption is usually stronger and clearer in function than the genitive noun here (one expects the imperative).' Actually, one might expect the vocative (cf. 163-4 δέσποιν', ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔρχομαι κατὰ χθονός, πανύστατόν σε προσπίτνουσ' αἰτήσομαι and 280-1 "Αδμηθ', ὁρᾷς γὰρ τἀμὰ πράγμαθ' ὡς ἔχει, λέξαι θέλω σοι πρὶν θανεῖν ἃ βούλομαι. Simple παῦσαι, with no participle or genitive, is perfectly all right (cf. *Ion* 522, *HF* 1398, *IT* 554, *Tro.* 1046, *Or.* 1240, etc.), and so there is no reason to depart from Hayley's original suggestion "Αδμηθ', which my second printing adopts.

ADDENDUM: MEDEA

6-15

οὐ γὰρ ἂν δέσποιν' ἐμὴ
Μήδεια πύργους γῆς ἔπλευσ' Ἰωλκίας
ἔρωτι θυμὸν ἐκπλαγεῖσ' Ἰάσονος·
οὐδ' ἂν κτανεῖν πείσασα Πελιάδας κόρας
πατέρα κατῴκει τήνδε γῆν Κορινθίαν
⟨φίλων τε τῶν πρὶν ἀμπλακοῦσα καὶ πάτρας.
καὶ πρὶν μὲν εἶχε κἀνθάδ' οὐ μεμπτὸν βίον⟩
ξὺν ἀνδρὶ καὶ τέκνοισιν, ἁνδάνουσα μὲν
φυγὰς πολίταις ὧν ἀφίκετο χθόνα
αὐτῷ τε πάντα ξυμφέρουσ' Ἰάσονι·
ἥπερ μεγίστη γίγνεται σωτηρία,
ὅταν γυνὴ πρὸς ἄνδρα μὴ διχοστατῇ.

11 ante h. v. lac. indic. Kovacs, 10b suppl. Willink: vide *CQ* 41 (1991), 30-5   12 φυγὰς πολίταις S. Harrison, preeunte Pierson: φυγῇ πολιτῶν (πολίταις V^3) C   13 αὐτῷ Sakorraphos: αὐτὴ C

Here again is my text. Slings thinks I am being hypercritical and that my lacuna is unnecessary. He writes 'What the nurse seems to be saying is "Medea wouldn't have settled and wouldn't now be living (κατοικέω can mean both) in Corinth (as she in fact does), with her husband (no longer true) and children (true), pleasing the Corinthians (no longer true) and in harmony with Jason (no longer true)"'. One would have thought that this summary, with its frequent and contradictory parentheses, would make an excellent argument against the soundness of the text, rather than the defense for which it is intended. Slings explains all this to-ing and fro-ing as forgetfulness on the part of the nurse, but such realism seems foreign to tragedy and nowhere more so than in the Euripidean prologue, where clarity is even more crucial than otherwise. Slings also appeals to the fact that anacoloutha, sentences started one way and finished another, do occur. I wonder if he has any examples in any genre of a sentence with this

many zigzags to it (at least three, to judge by Slings's parentheses). By contrast the simple hypothesis of a lacuna before 11 eliminates all this backing and filling.

When we come to transmitted φυγῇ πολιτῶν in 12, there seems to be room for doubt. D., influenced by the extreme rarity of the 'reverse attraction' of πολιτῶν ὧν for πολίταις ὧν as well as the lack of perspicuity in the dative φυγῇ, daggers the two words. Slings thinks there is nothing wrong with either. D.'s daggers, I believe, are fully justified since no audience could understand φυγῇ πολιτῶν as anything other than 'by the flight, or exile, of the citizens', which is nonsense here. It is the editorial policy of the Loeb series to eschew obeli where a plausible conjecture exists and the sense is not in serious doubt. That is what I have done here even though the postulated corruption (πολίταις to πολιτῶν) is not easy to explain.

Slings also defends transmitted αὐτή, which, he says, is justified because Medea's μέν-clause states that Medea was loved by the Corinthians while the present clause discusses 'her private life', and so αὐτή does not pose a problem. Yet without examples I will not readily believe that αὐτή means 'in private life'. It means 'herself' as opposed to other persons or things connected with her. Thus one could say, 'The Corinthians disliked Medea's husband but they loved Medea herself'. It is Medea herself who pleased the Corinthians, and it makes no sense to follow this by saying 'and she herself cooperated in all things with Jason', as if Medea's adherents, slaves, or relatives had been the subject of the preceding clause. Sakorraphos' αὐτῷ, though not certain, is intelligible in a way that αὐτή is not: of all the males in Corinth Jason is, for Medea, the most important, and to signal this fact by αὐτῷ makes sense: 'Jason himself' as opposed to the other males with whom he could be associated.

746-53

Μη. ὄμνυ πέδον Γῆς πατέρα θ' Ἥλιον πατρὸς
τοὐμοῦ θεῶν τε συντιθεὶς ἅπαν γένος.
Αι. τί χρῆμα δράσειν ἢ τί μὴ δράσειν; λέγε.
Μη. μήτ' αὐτὸς ἐκ γῆς σῆς ἔμ' ἐκβαλεῖν ποτε,
μήτ' ἄλλος ἤν τις τῶν ἐμῶν ἐχθρῶν ἄγειν
χρῄζῃ μεθήσειν ζῶν ἑκουσίῳ τρόπῳ.

Αι. ὄμνυμι Γαῖαν φῶς τε λαμπρὸν Ἡλίου
θεούς τε πάντας ἐμμενεῖν ἅ σου κλύω.

746 πατέρα θ' Ἥλιον πατρὸς] ἡλίου θ' ἁγνὸν σέβας Tr$^{\gamma\rho}$ et $^{\gamma\rho}\Sigma^{b}$, quam lectionem ad 752 rettulit Musgrave 752 φῶς τε λαμπρὸν Ἡλίου Page: λαμπρὸν ἡλίου τε φῶς CALP: λαμπρόν θ' ἡλίου φάος BODV (θ' om. B): λαμ]προν . [Π^{5} (θ'[vel φ'[pot. qu. η[): Ἡλίου θ' ἁγνὸν σέβας Porson e Σ^{b} ad 746 (ἡλίου θ' ἁγνὸν σέλας hic in textu habet Nv; σέλας iam coni. Musgrave)

At *Euripidea* 170-1 I pointed out that the reading of the γρ-variant at 746, which Musgrave saw belonged instead to 752, and the variant in the Neapolitanus (Nv) were both too good to be secondary. I recommended abandoning Page's attempt to get sense and meter out of the other mss., and I printed unchanged the reading of Nv, Ἡλίου θ' ἁγνὸν σέλας, the last word confirming Musgrave's conjecture. I did not cite Diggle, *CQ* 33 (1983), 356-7 (=his *Euripidea* 270-1) or take issue with his view that σέβας is to be preferred to σέλας. I take the opportunity here of repairing this omission.

D. concedes that ἡλίου σέλας is regular, citing *El.* 866, *Tr.* 860, *Su.* 469 and *Rh.* 331, but he says that the presence of ἁγνὸν commends σέβας, citing *Cycl.* 580, A. *Eu.* 885, S. *OT* 830, S. *Ph.* 1289 and S. fr. 582 Radt. It is true that ἁγνὸν σέβας (θεοῦ τινος) is an attested phrase (though at *Eu.* 885 the adjective is probably predicative), and ἁγνὸν σέλας does not happen to be attested elsewhere. But the semantic equivalents of 'holy gleam (light, ray, face) of the sun' do occur: see E. fr. 443.1 ὦ λαμπρὸς αἰθὴρ ἡμέρας θ' ἁγνὸν φάος, S. *Ant.* τόδε λαμπάδος ἱερὸν ὄμμα, *El.* 86 ὦ φάος ἁγνόν, A. fr. 204c4 Radt ἱερὰ δ' ἀκτὶς σελ[(σελ[ήνης Görschen); cf. also *IT* 194, where ἱερὸν ὄμμ' αὐγᾶς might be sound, if possibly lacunose. I conclude that σέλας is as likely as σέβας to be what Euripides wrote.

ADDENDUM: HERACLIDAE

The end of the play

In *Euripidea Altera*, pp. 16-27 I discussed 'what one must frankly call incoherence at the end of the play', and I challenged the soundness of the text principally at three points. Since then William Allan has published a commentary on the play in the Aris & Phillips series.[1] He argues that the end of the play is correctly transmitted. The purpose of the following is to summarize where the argument now stands and if possible to move it further along.

1045-52

Αλ. τί δῆτα μέλλετ', εἰ πόλει σωτηρίαν
κατεργάσασθαι τοῖσί τ' ἐξ ὑμῶν χρεών,
κτείνειν τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδ', ἀκούοντες τάδε;
δείκνυσι γὰρ κέλευθον ἀσφαλεστάτην·
ἐχθρὸς μὲν ἀνήρ, ὠφελεῖ δὲ κατθανών.
κομίζετ' αὐτόν, δμῶες, εἶτα χρὴ κυσὶν
δοῦναι κτανόντας· μὴ γὰρ ἐλπίσῃς ὅπως
αὖθις πατρῴας ζῶν ἔμ' ἐκβαλεῖς χθονός.

I argued that in view of the situation—in which Eurystheus has just passed on a prophecy that he is to be buried in Attica, where he will prove a life-saving μέτοικος to Athens and a determined enemy to the descendants of Heracles when they attack Athens—it would make no sense for Alcmene to order his body to be thrown to the dogs (1050-1) since it is only if he is *buried* in Attic soil that Athens can hope for the benefits he promises. Allan thinks that throwing to the dogs is compatible with *later* burial, that Alcmene can have her revenge on her enemy by allowing his body to be torn by dogs for a period of time and then the Athenians can bury what is left. He ar-

[1] William Allan, ed. and trans., *Euripides: The Children of Heracles* (Warminster, 2001).

gues that when heroes are reburied, as happened with Orestes and Theseus, only their bones are said to be transferred, and hence the bones of Eurystheus, stripped of their flesh, are all that is necessary.

I would reply that while the sequence envisaged by Allan (first exposure, then burial) is theoretically possible, the absence of any mention of subsequent burial makes it unlikely that the audience would understand Alcmene in this way. After all, when someone in tragedy orders the exposure of a corpse, as happens in *Antigone* and Euripides' *Supplices*, there is no thought that this is a temporary condition, and no one hearing Alcmene's order to kill Eurystheus and give his body to the dogs would be likely to think 'She means that after a few days what is left will be buried'. Secondly, while Alcmene produces a convincing justification for allowing her servants to kill Eurystheus (the man is an enemy, and his death will be beneficial), she gives none for exposing his corpse. Thirdly, Eurystheus had said that his execution at the hands of Alcmene was no impediment to his being a beneficial presence under the Attic soil, but his instructions as regards burial (θανόντα γάρ με θάψεθ' οὗ τὸ μόρσιμον, 1030) surely imply that he is to be buried immediately after his death. It seems highly unlikely that he would regard the scenario proposed by Allan as equivalent of the honorific burial normally accorded to one of the powerful dead, and the fact that the bones of Orestes are all that the Spartans took from Tegea (all that was left of him, surely) is no reason to think that Athens, having allowed dogs to reduce Eurystheus to bones and then having buried these bones, would feel that she had acted properly toward the hero and could look forward to his bestowing blessings on them.[1] Lastly, at the point where one would expect not only a reference to subsequent burial but also a justification for the extreme measure of throwing a corpse to the dogs, we get instead a justification for the killing of Eurystheus: in 1051-2 Alcmene, explaining her orders (γὰρ), says that her enemy must not hope that he will live to exile her yet again. This explains the killing, not the exposure. I conclude that Allan's interpretation is

[1] It is open to Allan to say that the end of the play casts Athens in an ironic light, and so perhaps the Chorus are too dense to see that in not opposing Alcmene they are acting against the city's interests. I would maintain, however, that when five letters (κυσὶν) are all that stand between us and something sensible, it is methodologically unsound to appeal to complicated ironies whose presence elsewhere in the play is far from proven.

a fairly desperate expedient and involves far more implausibility than the alteration it is designed to avoid. I agree that there are objections to my χύσιν for κυσὶν since libations are not going to be made to Eurystheus by those who are to kill him, and the conjecture practically requires the additional change θανόντι for κτανόντας. But the difficulties with κυσὶν are considerable and are not sufficiently met by objecting to one particular substitute for it. Any of the dissylables suggested in my Loeb apparatus is superior to the reading of L, and the daggers I print to either side of κυσὶν are, I suggest, fully deserved.

1009-17

νῦν οὖν ἐπειδή μ' οὐ διώλεσαν τότε
πρόθυμον ὄντα, τοῖσιν Ἑλλήνων νόμοις
οὐχ ἁγνός εἰμι τῷ κτανόντι κατθανών·
πόλις τ' ἀφῆκε σωφρονοῦσα, τὸν θεὸν
μεῖζον τίουσα τῆς ἐμῆς ἔχθρας πολύ.
προσεῖπας, ἀντήκουσας· ἐντεῦθεν δὲ χρὴ
τὸν προστρόπαιον †τόν τε γενναῖον† καλεῖν.
οὕτω γε μέντοι τἄμ' ἔχει· θανεῖν μὲν οὐ
χρῄζω, λιπὼν δ' ἂν οὐδὲν ἀχθοίμην βίον.

At 1014-5, where both D. and I diagnose corruption, Allan thinks the text is sound and translates 'From now on I must be called the man whose blood calls for vengeance and the noble-minded one'. He says that in these lines Eurystheus 'expresses his ambiguous role vis-à-vis the Hcld. and the Athenians'. For the one group he will be the murdered man who demands vengeance, while for the other he will be 'noble in his recognition of Athens' kindness to him' and gracious in that he 'frees the Athenians from the pollution of his death (cf. 1011) and rewards them for their restraint (cf. 1012, 1026-36)'. Note first that there is no με in the Greek to justify Allan's 'I must be called'. Second, if two groups of people are to call Eurystheus by two different names, how are the audience to understand these two different subjects for the infinitive καλεῖν if they are not expressed? I find this very difficult. Third, is the contrast between the Heraclids' name for Eurystheus and the Athenians' name best brought out by connect-

ing them with τε? I should have thought not. Fourth, at this point in the play Eurystheus has not mentioned any circumstance that would justify the Athenians' calling him γενναῖος. He has not said that he frees the Athenians from the pollution of his death but only that pollution attaches to anyone who kills him. He has mentioned the Athenians' restraint but not said anything about rewarding them for it: this comes in his next speech. Hence Allan's notion of two names employed by two groups of people, already difficult to read out of the text, runs into the further difficulty that the second of the names is unintelligible at this point in the play.

My proposal was to adopt F. W. Schmidt's τόνδε for τόν τε and mark a lacuna at that point, e.g. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ χρὴ / τὸν προστροπαῖον τόνδε ⟨δυσσεβῶς θανεῖν / ἢ σ' ἐκ φόνου σωθέντα⟩ γενναῖον καλεῖν, 'Henceforth the suppliant must be impiously put to death or, being saved from slaughter, must call you generous'. To this John Gibert, *BMCR* 8.1 (1997), 50, objects: 'Eurystheus will in effect say "Thank you" if he is spared by Alcmene. This ill suits his attitude of defiance . . . and makes him appear to imagine mercy as a real possibility, as nothing else in the speech does'. As to the second objection, 1012-3 mention the city's decision to spare his life, and 1009-11 allude to the pollution that will attach to anyone who kills him, and it is hard to see why he would say these things to Alcmene if not to urge her to adopt the more merciful course. The same story is told by the γε μέντοι in 1016, which means that his words about not being vexed at dying are in opposition to earlier words, presumably portraying mercy as the superior course. As for the 'thank you', I do not see why Eurystheus should not call Alcmene generous if she should spare his life. This is not abject truckling but the minimum recognition of a kindness bestowed.

1040-4

ἀλλὰ μήτε μοι χοὰς
μήθ' αἷμ' ἐάσητ' εἰς ἐμὸν στάξαι τάφον.
κακὸν γὰρ αὐτοῖς νόστον ἀντὶ τῶνδ' ἐγὼ
δώσω· διπλοῦν δὲ κέρδος ἕξετ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ·
ὑμᾶς τ' ὀνήσω τούσδε τε βλάψω θανών.

Allan translates 1040-1 'But do not allow libations or blood to drip on to my tomb' in preference to 'But do not omit to pour libations or blood onto my tomb', first suggested in the Beck-Headlam edition of the play. He notes that offering such libations was the normal thing at a hero's tomb, and he reasonably attempts to explain the departure from the norm here. He rejects the idea (Pearson *ad loc.*) that the prohibition applies only to the Heraclidae since they have not been mentioned since 1036. (He might also have mentioned that all the other instructions in this speech are addressed to the Athenians.) Instead, he thinks the spirit of the murdered man is to remain unappeased until he has brought disaster on his enemies. This is curious logic. It seems perverse to keep a hero angry by witholding customary libations since that anger is just as likely to flare up at the witholders. By contrast, if a hero has reason to be angry at his worshipers' enemies, offerings made by the worshipers will not, one would think, reduce that anger. I pointed out that ἀντὶ τῶνδε in 1042 suggests some positive action on the part of the Athenians, not merely their prevention of something. Allan's note on 1042 reads '**In return for this:** i.e. in return for the city's sparing him and honoring his cult'. But sparing Eurystheus was last mentioned in 1027, and many other topics have been discussed since then. As for honoring his cult, the only directions given are ἀλλὰ μήτε μοι χοὰς μήθ' αἷμ' ἐάσητ' εἰς ἐμὸν στάξαι τάφον, and if that is to be interpreted as Allan does, the Athenians are not asked to do but merely to refrain. This hardly constitutes 'honoring his cult'. And if merely refraining was what Eurystheus asked of the Athenians, he surely would have said ἀντὶ τοῦδ'.

By contrast, if we translate as I do in the Loeb, the meaning accords with ordinary cult practice and makes sense of 'in return for these things'. The cost is a rare construction, but since it is a rare construction attested in tragedy I do not find the price overly high.

ADDENDUM: HECUBA

The use of eisodoi

How did Euripides use the two eisodoi in the first production of *Hecuba*? I used them one way in my edition, but Judith Mossman's *Wild Justice: A Study of Euripides'* Hecuba, published the same year as my Loeb volume, assigns them differently. In my edition Eisodos A leads to the center of the Greek encampment and to the seashore where Polydorus' corpse is discovered, while Eisodos B leads to inland Thrace where Polymestor lives. For Mossman one eisodos leads to the center of the Greek camp and inland Thrace and the other to the seashore. We thus agree that one of the eisodoi must lead to inland Thrace and the other to the seashore, but we differ in where we put the bulk of the Greek army: does it lie on the same eisodos as inland Thrace (Mossman) or down the seaward eisodos (Loeb)?

The interpretation of the play is little affected by the answer we give to this question (I discuss the difference it might make at the end of this note), but most of the evidence seems to point to the Loeb staging. It is common ground between Mossman and me that the center of the Greek camp is down the same eisodos as the tomb of Achilles and that Odysseus leaves with Polyxena to sacrifice her to Achilles by the same eisodos by which he arrived, the same one used later by Talthybius and Agamemnon. Yet that tomb must be near the seashore if Achilles is to be seen rising above it when he appeals to the Greeks for a γέρας. *A priori* we might think that the encampment would lie near the ships, and this is borne out by 1015, αἵδ' Ἀχαιῶν ναύλοχοι περιπτυχαί, which calls it a naval encampment and locates the *skene* a short distance from its center. To put the center of the camp in the opposite direction from the sea would be needlessly confusing. Then too the servant sent to fetch water returns with the veiled corpse of Polydorus, and it would be strange that Hecuba should suppose that this is the corpse of Polyxena if she knows that her daughter has been sacrificed at the end of the opposite eisodos from the one down which she sent the servant.

Consider too the play's last anapests:

ἴτε πρὸς λιμένας σκηνάς τε, φίλαι,
τῶν δεσποσύνων πειρασόμεναι
μόχθων· στερρὰ γὰρ ἀνάγκη.

It is plain that in making their way to the ships they are also making their way to the tents of the Greeks.

The only contrary evidence is that Hecuba asks Agamemnon to send her servant διὰ στρατοῦ (889), and Mossman concludes that this means the eisodos that leads to the camp (pp. 63-4). But surely the Greek encampment is to be thought of as extending in both directions, so that even for a journey inland one would have to pass 'through the army'. The same is true of the city of Thebes in *Bacchae*: see above on *Ba*. 346-54.

What difference does it make? We avoid confusing the audience, of course, in the ways indicated above. Beyond this, however, it should be noted that one of the eisodoi, often the one that leads from far away, is frequently much less used but for that reason is the more marked of the two, often because it represents danger or salvation. In *Oedipus Tyrannos*, for example, the foreign eisodos is used for Creon's return from Delphi but gets no further use until the appearance of the Corinthian messenger. (The situation is the opposite in *Agamemnon*, where after the Chorus's entrance the domestic eisodos is not used until the arrival of Aegisthus.) The 'neglected' eisodos is all the more striking for being little used, and we often get the impression that an arrival by that road is somehow decisive, whether for good or ill. The impression of a change of fortune is the one, I would argue, that we are meant to get when, first, the serving woman is sent down the inland eisodos and, later, Polymestor arrives from that quarter. The fact that the sea is, in this play, the element on which the Greeks are at home, in contrast to the inland home of the barbarian Thracians, may play a role as well.

ADDENDUM: SUPPLICES

42-6

> ἱκετεύω σε, γεραιά, γεραιῶν ἐκ στομάτων πρὸς
>   γόνυ πίπτουσα τὸ σόν·
> †ἄνομοι τέκνα λῦσαι φθιμένων νεκύων οἳ†
>   καταλείπουσι μέλη
> θανάτῳ λυσιμελεῖ θηρσὶν ὀρείοισι βοράν·

44 ἄνα μοι (Brodaeus) τέκνα λῦσαι ’κ (Page) φθιμένων νεκύων ὧν Diggle

At *GRBS* 14 (1973), 241-69 (=his *Euripidea* 59-62) D. argues that a corpse, unlike a ψυχή, cannot leave its limbs behind and that therefore the subject of καταλείπουσι must be the Thebans. He urges adoption of Brodaeus’ conjecture at the beginning of the line, Page’s ⟨’κ⟩ in the middle, and ὧν for οἳ at the end. The three changes are not consecutive. Even so the sense is disagreeably surprising. Are only the Seven to be taken up, and the other corpses left to rot? That is the implication of ’κ φθιμένων. Diggle says ‘from the corpses’ equals ‘from the corpse-strewn battlefield’, but 762, which he cites, parallels only the *expression*, not the idea. And why ‘perished corpses whose limbs’ when the corpses *are* the limbs?

Since neither sense nor paleography is in favor of this conjecture, we should consider sense first and let paleography fare as best it can. Two ways lie open. If we accept D.’s view that the Thebans must be the subject of καταλείπουσι, we must find a way to make them the antecedent to οἳ. A. Y. Campbell on p. 123 of his edition of *Helen* proposes ἀνόμους κατάπαυσαι. The corruption, though hard, can be explained (see Collard *ad loc.*), and the sense is good. But D.’s view is not certain. Obviously ‘corpses’ can’t ‘leave their limbs behind’, but ‘the dead’, conceived of as their souls, are another matter. In Homer, of course, the dead man ‘himself’ is identified with his corpse (see *Il.* 1.4), and only the ψυχή or θυμός is the subject of a verb of leaving. But in later Greek the dead man is not so identified,

the dead are said to leave such things behind as house, family, tears, or a good name. (The middle is frequently, but not exclusively, used.) There is no reason why the antecedent of οἳ and thus the subject of καταλείπουσι could not be 'the dead'. Making it likely that this is the case is the dative of manner θανάτῳ, 'in death'. In the following instances where θανάτῳ is dative of manner without a preposition, the subject of the verb is the decedent himself: *Il.* 21.281 (=*Od.* 5.313), *Od.* 11.412, 15.359, 22.462, 24.34, A. *Ag.* 1493 (=1517), *Cho.* 1008, E. *Med.* 146, 650, *Tro.* 1255, *Hel.* 1208, *Pho.* 1483, and fr. 11. The only counter-example I have been able to find is Pindar, *P.* 3.42. In all these examples the dative goes with a *verbum moriendi vel interficiendi*, which is in effect what καταλείπουσι is if the dead are its subject. Perhaps, therefore, we should read ἀνόμων ἄπο λῦσαι νέκυας φθιμένων οἳ καταλείπουσι μέλη: 'free from lawless men the corpses of the dead who in limb-loosening death are leaving their limbs behind as food for mountain beasts!' Italie in his edition had already suggested transposing φθιμένων and νεκύων to match the position of φθιμένους in the antistrophe. *Pace* D., this is not mere περιεργία but a sensible thing to do. As for the change of ending, scribes are always creating false agreement between two adjacent words, and that may have happened here. The beginning of the line wears a less inevitable look, but perhaps someone can improve on my suggestion.

73-8

ἴτ' ὦ ξυνῳδοὶ κακοῖς,
ἴτ' ὦ ξυναλγηδόνες
χορὸν τὸν Ἅιδας σέβει·
διὰ παρῇδος ὄνυχι λευκᾶς
αἱματοῦτε χρῶτα φόνιον· ⟨ἒ ἕ.⟩
τὰ γὰρ φθιτῶν τοῖς ὁρῶσι κόσμος.

D., *Studies* 6, translates 78 'for *that* is the *proper* honour for the dead in the eyes of the living'. My italics highlight two areas of concern. D. cites, for demonstrative τά, *Hec.* 626, *El.* 940, *Herc.* 227 and *Tr.* 218. No one ever doubted that the article followed by a δέ can have demonstrative force, and that is what we have in all four of his

examples. But none helps to defend 'that' as a translation of bare and unadorned τά. Secondly, D. imports 'proper' into the translation of κόσμος. Furthermore, word-order seems to tell against taking φθιτῶν with κόσμος.

It seems more reasonable to translate τὰ φθιτῶν together as 'honor for the dead'. After all, τὰ θεῶν means 'worship of the gods'. The whole therefore means 'the rites we owe the dead are an adornment to the living'.

152-4

Αδ. ἀλλ' οἱ μένοντες τοὺς ἀπόντας ἠδίκουν.
Θη. οὔ πού σφ' ἀδελφὸς χρημάτων νοσφίζεται;
Αδ. ταύτῃ δικάζων ἦλθον· εἶτ' ἀπωλόμην.

154 ταύτῃ Blomfield: ταυτὶ L: ταῦτ' ἐκδικάζων Hermann, Lenting

Blomfield's ταύτῃ, attractive paleographically, gives worse sense. The preceding line talks about both brothers. 'It was on this side' is therefore unclear. Hermann's and Lenting's conjecture is preferable. For ἐκδικάζειν cf. 1215.

467-72

ἐγὼ δ' ἀπαυδῶ πᾶς τε Καδμεῖος λεὼς
Ἄδραστον ἐς γῆν τήνδε μὴ παριέναι·
εἰ δ' ἔστιν ἐν γῇ, πρὶν θεοῦ δῦναι σέλας
λύσαντα σεμνὰ στεμμάτων μυστήρια
τῆσδ' ἐξελαύνειν, μηδ' ἀναιρεῖσθαι νεκροὺς
βίᾳ, προσήκοντ' οὐδὲν Ἀργείων πόλει.

At *GRBS* 14 (1973), 243, n. 11 (=his *Euripidea* 61) D. translates 470 'release the μυστήρια (Demeter's temple: cf. 173) from the suppliants' garlands.' He cites no other parallels for simplex λύω with ablatival genitive. It's also not clear why the Herald should concern himself with freeing the temple of Demeter. Furthermore, word-order suggests that σεμνὰ στεμμάτων μυστήρια is a single nominal phrase. As a look at LSJ makes clear, μυστήριον is a word of wide

application to various aspects of religion, and there is no reason why it cannot refer to the religious force exerted by suppliant boughs. It seems more plausible to render 'break the spell of suppliant boughs and drive him from this land before the sun goes down'.

573-5

Θη. πολλοὺς ἔτλην δὴ χἀτέροις ἄλλους πόνους.
Κη. ἦ πᾶσιν οὖν ⟨σ'⟩ ἔφυσεν ἐξαρκεῖν πατήρ;
Θη. ὅσοι γ' ὑβρισταί· χρηστὰ δ' οὐ κολάζομεν.

573 χἀτέροις Diggle: -ους L, quo servato ἄλλοις Blomfield

D. says the Herald's reply will come more naturally if there is a dative in 573. But the two datives, the Herald's and the one D. give to Theseus, are of different kinds. Theseus' dative refers to persons on whose behalf he has labored, but the Herald's to those Theseus opposed. I see no gain here. And since Porson's and Dindorf's examples show the acceptability of χἀτέρους ἄλλους, perhaps it is best to make no change.

ADDENDUM: HERACLES

143-50

τίν' ἐς χρόνον ζητεῖτε μηκῦναι βίον;
τίν' ἐλπίδ' ἀλκήν τ' εἰσορᾶτε μὴ θανεῖν;
ἢ τὸν παρ' Ἅιδῃ πατέρα τῶνδε κείμενον
πιστεύεθ' ἥξειν; ὡς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀξίαν
τὸ πένθος αἵρεσθ' εἰ θανεῖν ὑμᾶς χρεών,
σὺ μὲν καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ἐκβαλὼν κόμπους κενοὺς
ὡς σύγγαμός σοι Ζεὺς τέκνου τε κοινεών,
σὺ δ' ὡς ἀρίστου φωτὸς ἐκλήθης δάμαρ.

How should we translate ὡς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀξίαν τὸ πένθος αἵρεσθ' εἰ θανεῖν ὑμᾶς χρεών? On the one hand τὸ πένθος αἵρεσθαι doesn't look like a periphrasis for 'grieve'. But on the other Bond's interpretation of ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀξίαν imputes to Lycus a concern (perhaps ironical) on Lycus' part that Heracles' family not suffer more than they deserve. Also the participial phrase in 148-50 goes well with 'how excessively you grieve that you must die', but much less well with 'how much undeserved suffering you are taking upon yourself'. 155-6 are ambiguous evidence. The first two words suggest Bond's view, the second clause suggests mine.

188-95

τὸ πάνσοφον δ' εὕρημα, τοξήρη σαγήν,
μέμφῃ· κλύων νυν τἀπ' ἐμοῦ σοφὸς γενοῦ.
ἀνὴρ ὁπλίτης δοῦλός ἐστι τῶν ὅπλων 190
θραύσας τε λόγχην οὐκ ἔχει τῷ σώματι 193
θάνατον ἀμῦναι, μίαν ἔχων ἀλκὴν μόνον· 194
καὶ τοῖσι συνταχθεῖσιν οὖσι μὴ ἀγαθοῖς 191
αὐτὸς τέθνηκε δειλίᾳ τῇ τῶν πέλας. 192
ὅσοι δὲ τόξοις χεῖρ' ἔχουσιν εὔστοχον, κτλ. 195

191-2 post 194 trai. Wilamowitz, eosdem del. Wecklein ad dat. τοῖσι συντ- cf. S. fr. 921 P

Wilamowitz' transposition has been thought to solve most of the problems of sense here, especially the meandering from weapons to companions and back. Renehan, *CP* 80 (1985), 151-2, accepts it but also points out some of the difficulties that remain. (1) There is the difficulty of taking τοῖσι συνταχθεῖσιν as instrumental dative. This is considerable, and he is right to point out that Wilamowitz' attempt to paraphrase as τέθνηκε τῷ τοὺς συνταχθέντας μὴ ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι is unlikely. Nor does the reference to Sophocles fr. 921 P help: σκαιοῖσι πολλοῖς εἷς σοφὸς διόλλυται is probably dative of agent, which would not suit our passage. The absence of context makes it difficult to use the fragment to prove the correctness of *HF* 191-2, and the appeal to it in default of more usable evidence has a slightly desperate air. Dobree suggested κἂν for καὶ. This addresses the problem, but the fact that emendation becomes necessary in addition to transposition means a loss in plausibility. It also leaves the next difficulty untouched.

(2) Renehan says 'A straightforward translation of vv. 191-92 will point up the awkwardness of this current interpretation: "And by means of those drawn up in battle line with him, if they be not brave, the hoplite himself is killed by means of the cowardice of those near him." At a minimum a connective ("and") before δειλίᾳ is wanted, and this we do not have. Next consider the word-order of 192: αὐτὸς τέθνηκε δειλίᾳ τῇ τῶν πέλας, "the hoplite himself is killed because of cowardice, <not his own but> that of his fellow-soldiers." Τῇ τῶν πέλας is deliberately placed, for emphasis, after δειλίᾳ; it is in explicit contrast to αὐτός. Verse 192 seems a self-contained unit.' So, in effect, there are two objections under this head, the awkward doubling of expressions for 'the cowardice of his companions' and the unwelcomeness of any addition to the self-contained expression αὐτὸς τέθνηκε δειλίᾳ τῇ τῶν πέλας.

Renehan goes on to 'correct' the passage by punctuating as an anacolouthon, with a dash after ἀγαθοῖς. He alleges that this anacolouthon is necessary if Amphitryon is to conceal the fallacious character of his argument. The argument, he says, requires him to show that a hoplite can get no help from his companions, but this he

can show only conditionally—if they are cowards. He conceals this weakness by his anacolouthic expression, beginning as if he were about to say καὶ τοῖσι συταχθεῖσιν, οὖσι μὴ ἀγαθοῖς, οὐδεμία ἀλκὴ ἔνεστιν, and the result comes out: 'And as for those drawn up in battle line, if they are not brave—the man himself is killed by the cowardice of those next to him.' The anacolouthon conceals the logically unjustified shift from conditional to absolute statement. This strikes me as unsatisfactory: it is not usual for Euripides' characters to make obviously fallacious arguments if good ones are available. And here he could have said 'The hoplite depends on the valor of those next to him in battle. If they are cowards, the battle will be lost and he will most likely be killed.' There is no reason to engage in the smoke-and-mirrors postulated by Renehan.

It begins to look as if Wilamowitz' transposition, which has led to Dobree's correction (effective against only one of the difficulties) and Renehan's unattractive repunctuation, should be reconsidered. Other remedies have been proposed,[1] but perhaps we should simply keep the transmitted order and mark a lacuna after 190:

ἀνὴρ ὁπλίτης δοῦλός ἐστι τῶν ὅπλων
⟨τάξεώς τε, νικᾶται γὰρ ἐν στρατηλάταις⟩
καὶ τοῖσι συνταχθεῖσιν οὖσι μὴ ἀγαθοῖς·
αὐτὸς τέθνηκε δειλίᾳ τῇ τῶν πέλας·
θραύσας τε λόγχην οὐκ ἔχει τῷ σώματι
θάνατον ἀμῦναι, μίαν ἔχων ἀλκὴν μόνον.

386-8

πέραν
δ' ἀργυρορρύτων Ἕβρου
διεπέρασεν ὄχθων,
Μυκηναίῳ πονῶν τυράννῳ.

---

[1] G. Vitelli, *RIFC* 10 (1882), 403-4, after canvassing some dismal alternatives, writes ἀνὴρ ὁπλίτης δοῦλός ἐστι τοῖς ὅπλοις / καὶ τοῖσι συνταχθεῖσιν οὖσι μὴ ἀγαθοῖς. But it is hard to see how the conditional force of the μὴ can be felt in such a sentence, for a man is a slave to those he his stationed with whether they are good or bad.

387 ἀργυρορρύτων Ἕβρου διεπέρασεν ὄχθων Wilamowitz: ἀργυρορρύταν ἕβρον διεπέρασ' ὄχθον L

R. Renehan in *HSCP* 67 (1963), 269-70, drawing on an article by Werner Jaeger in *RhM* 100 (1957), 384-5 (=*Scripta Minora* ii.517-24), made a strong case for retaining the readings of the Laurentianus with the exception of διεπέρασ' ὄχθον, which he changes to διεπέρασε μόχθον (the noun anticipated by Musgrave). It seems to me that this is exactly right, and that his argument, which has been neglected, could profitably be repeated with further substantiation.

In Wilamowitz's text, adopted also by Murray and D., πέραν functions as a preposition and διεπέρασεν is intransitive. But Jaeger showed that adverbial πέραν accords with the tendency for compound verbs to receive a reinforcement from seemingly otiose adverbs. Furthermore, transmitted ἀργυρορρύταν Ἕβρον looks exactly right as the object of διεπέρασ'. An adjective of the form ἀργυροδίνας should modify the name of the river directly, not its banks. He cites Callimachus *Hymn.* 6.13-4, but he could have cited *Il.* 21.195, *Od.* 14.257, Hes. *Th.* 265, Bacchyl. 11.26, 11.96, E. *HF* 368, *Tro.* 810, and *Ba.* 568. The upshot is that everything up to Ἕβρον is correctly transmitted, and it remains only to find a short syllable after διεπέρασ' and to eliminate its unwanted second object ὄχθον. With the reading διεπέρασ⟨ε, μ⟩όχθον Μυκηναίῳ πονῶν τυράννῳ, μόχ-θον is the internal object of the participle πονῶν, a construction neatly paralleled by *Hip.* 1367-9, μόχθους δ' ἄλλως τῆς εὐσεβίας εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπόνησα, and by other passages cited by Renehan.

153-8

Ἑκάβη, τί θροεῖς; τί δὲ θωΰσσεις;
ποῖ λόγος ἥκει; διὰ γὰρ μελάθρων
ἄιον οἴκτους οὓς οἰκτίζῃ.
διὰ δὲ στέρνων φόβος ἀίσσει
Τρῳάσιν, αἳ τῶνδ' οἴκων εἴσω
δουλείαν αἰάζουσιν.

156 ἄισσεν Murray, ἄιξεν Wilamowitz (~gB)

Are these lines lyric anapests? Should we therefore read Ἑκάβα? The clues are as follows. (1) The meter of strophe and antistrophe is basically like a regular system of recitative anapests. Only the second line of the antistrophe, with its sequence of four shorts, and the final paroemiac of both stanzas, with its seven longs, is reminiscent of lyric anapests. (2) The mss. give Ἑκάβη in 153. (3) Contrariwise, they give ἐπακουσομένα in 177. (4) Non-melic anapests are frequently used for entrances.

Items (2) and (3) in effect cancel each other out. We must emend one way or the other to make strophe and antistrophe either melic or non-melic. I suggest that the whole of the parodos is lyric. For the Chorus to shift from marching anapaests at the beginning of each stanza to melic anapaests in 162, 184, and 189 would make little sense. The occurrence of four shorts in a row and the heptamacron should be taken as read. It is true that marching anapaests are common in parodoi, but see *IT* 128-42.

167-71

ἒ ἔ.
μή νύν μοι τὰν
ἐκβακχεύουσαν Κασσάνδραν,
αἰσχύναν Ἀργείοισιν, 171
πέμψητ' ἔξω, 170

μαινάδ', ἐπ' ἄλγεσι δ' ἀλγυνθῶ.

I don't see how αἰσχύναν 'Αργείοισιν can mean anything like 'to be degraded by the Argives' (Barlow) or 'to be outraged by the Greeks' (Lee). It ought to mean 'as a disgrace to the Argives', and as this is impossible sense in the context, it prompts the conjecture 'Ιδαίαισιν to put the disgrace where it must inevitably fall. Hecuba is concerned about the disgrace to herself and her fellow-captives if Cassandra should come forth in her mad state. If this is thought to be too radical, perhaps αἰσχύναν ⟨ἐν γ'⟩ 'Αργείοις, where ἐν would mean 'in the sight of, in the judgment of'.

272-4

Εκ. τί δ' ἁ τοῦ χαλκεομήστορος Ἕκτορος δάμαρ,
'Ανδρομάχα τάλαινα, τίν' ἔχει τύχαν;
Τα. καὶ τήνδ' 'Αχιλλέως ἔλαβε παῖς ἐξαίρετον.

I see no point in καὶ here: 'Her too Achilles' son has taken as his special prize' is the only meaning I can extract, and that is nonsense here where not a word has been said hitherto about Neoptolemus' other prizes. Emendations for καὶ τήνδ' are ταύτην (Herwerden), κοίτην (Burges), and εὐνὴν (Wecklein post Burges). Burges has a good chance of being correct. For κοίτη applied to a person, like λέχος or εὐνή, see S. fr. 546.

379-81

τὰ δ' οἴκοι τοῖσδ' ὅμοι' ἐγίγνετο·
χῆραί γ' ἔθνῃσκον, οἱ δ' ἄπαιδες ἐν δόμοις
ἄλλως τέκν' ἐκθρέψαντες· οὐδὲ πρὸς τάφοις

380 γ' Diggle: τ' VPQ: vide Denniston, GP 144-5

D. changes τ' to γ' in 380, the slightest of changes. But Matthiae's more expensive solution of marking a lacuna before 380 seems to be necessary if we are to do justice to what is transmitted. With no lacuna, 380-1 must be translated (with τ') 'not only were the widows

dying but so were the childless, having raised children in their houses for nothing' or (with γ') 'the widows were dying and so were the childless, having raised children in their houses for nothing'. But it is far better that χῆραι and ἄπαιδες should be predicative ('died in widowhood, died childless') and the first of these can be true only if there is a subject expressed for χῆραι ἔθνῃσκον. To achieve the meaning '<Wives> died as widows, while others died childless, having raised children for nought in their homes' we can save transmitted τ' and write

τὰ δ' οἴκοι τοῖσδ' ὅμοι' ἐγίγνετο·
⟨γυναῖκες ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους ἀπώλλυσαν⟩
χῆραί τ' ἔθνῃσκον, οἱ δ' ἄπαιδες ἐν δόμοις
ἄλλως τέκν' ἐκθρέψαντες.

394-7

τὰ δ' Ἕκτορός σοι λύπρ' ἄκουσον ὡς ἔχει·
δόξας ἀνὴρ ἄριστος οἴχεται θανών,
καὶ τοῦτ' Ἀχαιῶν ἵξις ἐξεργάζεται·
εἰ δ' ἦσαν οἴκοι, χρηστὸς ὢν ἐλάνθεν' ἄν.

397 ὢν ἐλάνθαν' ἄν Burges, Schaefer: ὢν ἐλάνθανεν PQ et Chr. Pat. 1658: ἔλαθεν ἂν γεγὼς VΣ[i]

D. prints Burges's and Schaefer's conjectural ὢν ἐλάνθαν' ἄν instead of V's ἔλαθεν ἂν γεγώς. Two considerations lead me to adopt the reading of V and the scholiast. (1) It's slightly easier to explain the reading of PQ and Christus Patiens as a corruption of the reading of V than the other way round. γεγώς is a good tragic word, and it is not hard to imagine that it lost out to the commoner word ὤν by glossing and subsequent rearrangment of unmetrical words. Lee says that the reading of V looks like the work of 'an enterprising scribe', but he cites no similar handiwork. To me the reading of PQ seems like a clear instance of trivialization. (2) The aorist seems to me to give better sense than the imperfect in this situation, where the summing up of Hector's life is in question: not 'we would not have

been noticing how brave he was being' but 'people would not have marked what a brave man he was'.

400-2

φεύγειν μὲν οὖν χρὴ πόλεμον ὅστις εὖ φρονεῖ·
εἰ δ' ἐς τόδ' ἔλθοι, στέφανος οὐκ αἰσχρὸς πόλει
καλῶς ὀλέσθαι, μὴ καλῶς δὲ δυσκλεές.

To perish nobly is a glorious thing and to perish ignobly a disgraceful thing not merely 'for a city' but in general. The thought seems more general here, and I am attracted by Nauck's πέλει for πόλει.

433-9

δέκα γὰρ ἐκπλήσας ἔτη
πρὸς τοῖσιν ἐνθάδ' ἵξεται μόνος πάτραν
⟨ ⟩
†οὗ δὴ στενὸν δίαυλον ᾤκισται πέτρας†
δεινὴ Χάρυβδις ὠμοβρώς τ' ὀρειβάτης
Κύκλωψ, Λιγυστίς θ' ἡ συῶν μορφώτρια
Κίρκη, θαλάσσης θ' ἁλμυρᾶς ναυάγια,
λωτοῦ τ' ἔρωτες, Ἡλίου θ' ἁγναὶ βόες,

434 post h. v. lac. indic. Heath 435-43 del. Tyrrell

Tyrrell's deletion is pretty desperate, but so is the situation here. In 434 Odysseus is back in Ithaca, then there is a lacuna, but when we resume we find a reference to 'where the dread Charybdis is settled on the narrow strait of cliff and the Cyclops and Circe', clearly referring to a period before his arrival home. And since these monsters inhabit different places, it is all a terrible muddle.

It need not be. Instead of marking a lacuna after πάτραν, as D. does, mark it after οὗ δὴ, which looks as if it goes with πάτραν . The passage, with my *exempli gratia* supplement, then runs as follows:

δέκα γὰρ ἐκπλήσας ἔτη
πρὸς τοῖσιν ἐνθάδ' ἵξεται μόνος πάτραν
οὗ δὴ ⟨στένειν μέγ' ἄξι' εὑρήσει κακά.
νόστου δ' ἐπισχήσει νιν ἄγρυπνος φύλαξ
ἢ πρὸς⟩ στενὸν δίαυλον ᾤκισται πέτραις
δεινὴ Χάρυβδις, ὠμοβρὼς τ' ὀρειβάτης κτλ.

The supplement restores a coherent sequence of events and a coherent geography and also attempts by the word στένειν to account for the omission.

455-7

ποῦ σκάφος τὸ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ; ποῖ πόδ' ἐμβαίνειν με
χρή;
οὐκέτ' ἂν φθάνοις ἂν αὔραν ἱστίοις καραδοκῶν,
ὡς μίαν τριῶν Ἐρινὺν τῆσδέ μ' ἐξάξων χθονός.

457 ἐρινὺν VΣ[1]: -νῦν P: -ννῦν Q: -νύων Burges: cf. IT 931, 970, 1456

Are the Erinyes three in number? D., *Studies*, p. 62, shows that they are sometimes so conceived and gives two places where Euripides apparently so conceives them. Why is it then 'pointless' (D.'s word) for Cassandra to call herself one of the three Erinyes? It may not be perfectly obligatory that she mention their number, but 'pointless' seems a bit strong. D.'s own suggestion—that the three Erinyes she means are herself, Clytaemestra, and Aegisthus—seems not pointless but forced. Clytaemestra has been alluded to at 361, 363, and (glancingly) 446-7, but Aegisthus is neither mentioned nor alluded to anywhere in the play. And there is a sharp difference of role between the pair who murder Agamemnon on the one hand and Cassandra who inspires Clytaemestra's jealousy on the other. So how is the audience supposed to work out who the three are? And how many lines of dialogue will they miss while they are doing it? Better to translate 'one Erinys of the three' or even adopt the conjecture of Burges (for the synizesis see the *IT* passages cited in D.'s app. crit.).

474-8

ἦ μὲν τύραννος κἀς τύραννʼ ἐγημάμην,
κἀνταῦθʼ ἀριστεύοντʼ ἐγεινάμην τέκνα,
οὐκ ἀριθμὸν ἄλλως ἀλλʼ ὑπερτάτους Φρυγῶν·
οὓς Τρῳὰς οὐδʼ Ἑλληνὶς οὐδὲ βάρβαρος
γυνὴ τεκοῦσα κομπάσειεν ἄν ποτε.

477 οὓς Stephanus: οὐ VPQ et Aps.

Nowhere else in Euripides are the Trojans contrasted with non-Greeks (βάρβαροι), as they are in 477. 'Neither Trojan nor Greek nor barbarian' is an unexampled tripartition of an invariably bipartite world. It is hard to see why Hecuba should speak thus here. Her point is that the children she bore were the very best in the world, and now she has lost them. This point is, if anything, more forcibly made by the single exhaustive dichotomy 'neither Greek nor barbarian'. There are grounds for suspicion.

The first word of the line is conjectural in any case. We could keep transmitted οὐ and supply an object for τεκοῦσα (which it needs) by writing Weil's οὐ τοιάδʼ. It might be objected that Trojans in Euripides seldom apply the word βάρβαρος to themselves. That is true as a tendency, but in this play see 771, 973, 991, and 1021. The corruption is not an easy one, but the sense gains appreciably with the change from 'No Trojan or Greek or barbarian woman bore *them*' (true—if we except Hecuba—but trivial) to 'No Greek or barbarian woman bore *their like*'. Weil completes the job by writing οὔθʼ . . . οὔτε, conjectures that cost little to adopt. We might, however, write οὔθʼ . . . οὐδὲ: see Denniston, *GP* 193.

506-10

ἄγετε τὸν ἁβρὸν δή ποτʼ ἐν Τροίᾳ πόδα,
νῦν δʼ ὄντα δοῦλον, στιβάδα πρὸς χαμαιπετῆ
πέτρινά τε κρήδεμνʼ, ὡς πεσοῦσʼ ἀποφθαρῶ
δακρύοις καταξανθεῖσα. τῶν δʼ εὐδαιμόνων
μηδένα νομίζετʼ εὐτυχεῖν, πρὶν ἂν θάνῃ.

Dobree's δέμνι' for κρήδεμν' is probably right. Neither 'head-dress' nor 'battlement' is in place here. With πέτρινα the idea of battlement would intrude itself (so Barlow, who welcomes the idea), but we are better off with a repetition of the idea of a hard place to sleep, with no suggestion of something upon Hecuba's head, to say nothing of a high place to jump from: 'my pallet upon the ground, my stony bed'.

579-82

Εκ. αἰαῖ Αν. τῶνδ' ἀλγέων,
Εκ. ὦ Ζεῦ Αν. καὶ συμφορᾶς.
Εκ. τέκεα Αν. πρίν ποτ' ἦμεν.

The speaker assignments are a problem here. Willink draws attention to the 'counterchange' (lines belonging in the strophe to Hecuba belong in the antistrophe to Andromache and vice versa). There are two examples of this in Sophocles' *OC* (509-33 and 1724-50) but no other instance in Euripides. He also notes that in an amoibaion speaker change at stanza boundary is normal, and the lack of it at 591 and 595 is an oddity. (The only prima facie examples, *Su.* 1145 and 1152, can be eliminated without a great deal of trouble.) The solution I adopt in my Loeb edition is Willink's.

Here I discuss a smaller point in 579-80. Can we regard τῶνδ' ἀλγέων καὶ συμφορᾶς as acceptable Greek? Can one say 'these pains and misfortune' for 'these pains and this misfortune'? I have discovered no examples and so suggest συμφορᾶν.

595

Αν. οἵδε πόθοι μεγάλοι Εκ. σχετλία, τάδε πάσχομεν ἄλγη

595 σχετλία Burges: σχέτλια VPQ et gB: σχέτλιαι Scaliger

Neuter plural σχέτλια gives better sense than the conjectural feminine singular σχετλία: Andromache is not being cruel or hard-hearted. To mend the meter I have adopted Kirchhoff's σχέτλι' ⟨ὡς⟩,

which is better sense than Musgrave's (paleographically attractive) σχέτλι' ⟨αὖ⟩.

636-8

τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τῷ θανεῖν ἴσον λέγω,
τοῦ ζῆν δὲ λυπρῶς κρεῖσσόν ἐστι κατθανεῖν.
†ἀλγεῖ γὰρ οὐδὲν τῶν κακῶν ᾐσθημένος·†

638 lac. (οὐδὲν ⟨ . . . οὐδὲν⟩ τῶν) indic. Seidler ⟨ὅστις οὐκ ἔβλεψέ πω τὸ φέγγος, οὐδὲν⟩ e.g. Diggle

I agree with D. that this is lacunose but think a different supplement would make Andromache's argument clearer:

ἀλγεῖ γὰρ οὐδὲν ⟨τῶν ἀγεννήτων πλέον
τεθνεώς τις, οὐδὲν⟩ τῶν κακῶν ᾐσθημένος.

Death is the same as not being born, and death is preferable to living in pain, for the dead person, who is unaware of his woes, feels no more pain than those who were never born.

645-50

ἃ γὰρ γυναιξὶ σώφρον' ἔσθ' ηὑρημένα,
ταῦτ' ἐξεμόχθουν Ἕκτορος κατὰ στέγας.
πρῶτον μέν, ἔνθα (κἂν προσῇ κἂν μὴ προσῇ
ψόγος γυναιξίν) αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐφέλκεται
κακῶς ἀκούειν, ἥτις οὐκ ἔνδον μένει,
τούτου παρεῖσα πόθον ἔμιμνον ἐν δόμοις·

In 647 ἔνθα, followed by a long parenthesis, makes an awkward sentence that is hard to understand: 'First, at the point where (whether blame attaches to women or not) this very thing attracts criticism, not remaining indoors, letting go of the desire for this, I remained in the house.' Lee thinks that 'I was prudent' should perhaps be understood with ἔνθα, and this improves matters somewhat, though then we need at least a raised period at the end of 649. But the

parenthesis is not exactly clear in itself: Andromache could mean 'whether or not blame attaches to women in general' (less likely) as well as 'whether or not (individual) women are criticized'. And the relation of the parenthesis to αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐφέλκεται κτλ. is less than lucid: we expect something like 'whether or not blame attaches to women *in other respects*, this very fact draws criticism'.

In place of ἔνθα outside the parenthesis, Fecht proposed ἔνδον with no parenthesis:

πρῶτον μέν, ἔνδον κἂν προσῇ κἂν μὴ προσῇ
ψόγος γυναιξίν, αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐφέλκεται
κακῶς ἀκούειν, ἥτις οὐκ ἔνδον μένει·
τούτου παρεῖσα πόθον ἔμιμνον ἐν δόμοις.

'In the first place, whether or not blame attaches to women *inside the house*, the very fact of their going outside draws criticism. Letting go a desire for this, etc.' This reads more easily.

673-6

σὲ δ', ὦ φίλ' Ἕκτορ, εἶχον ἄνδρ' ἀρκοῦντά μοι,
ξυνέσει γένει πλούτῳ τε κἀνδρείᾳ μέγαν,
ἀκήρατον δέ μ' ἐκ πατρὸς λαβὼν δόμων
πρῶτος τὸ παρθένειον ἐζεύξω λέχος.

Paley's note on 674 (his 669) reads 'Kirchhoff places a comma only after ξυνέσει, by which the datives following depend on μέγαν. But this verse is not an elegant one, and reads rather like an interpolation'. Note the pell-mell throwing together of personal qualities (ξύνεσις, ἀνδρεία) with extrinsic things such as high birth and wealth. If we delete, Andromache is being understated here in describing her husband as good enough for her (ἀρκοῦντα). Actors are sometimes impatient with understatement, and there is some likelihood that 674 is a specimen of their work.

713-8

Τα. ἔδοξε τόνδε παῖδα . . . πῶς εἴπω λόγον;
Αν. μῶν οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δεσπότην ἡμῖν ἔχειν;
Τα. οὐδεὶς Ἀχαιῶν τοῦδε δεσπόσει ποτέ.
Αν. ἀλλ' ἐνθάδ' αὐτοῦ λείψανον Φρυγῶν λιπεῖν;
Τα. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως σοι ῥᾳδίως εἴπω κακά.
Αν. ἐπῄνεσ' αἰδῶ, πλὴν ἐὰν λέγῃς κακά.

718 καλά p, quo accepto τάδε pro κακά 717 Wecklein (SBAM 1922, 98) et Jackson, vix recte

The transmitted text of 717-8, with its is inelegant repetition of κακά at the ends of two successive lines, is suspicious for several reasons. First, if Andromache has just been told that Talthybius hesitates to tell her bad news, why should she say, 'I approve of your hesitation, unless you are telling me bad news'? Perhaps this can be interpreted to mean 'Tell it to me straight, doctor'. But hesitation (αἰδώς) is scarcely appropriate when you are telling good news and is arguably appropriate when you have something painful to tell, so how can Andormache say she approves of it *except* in the case of bad news?

But Wecklein's proposal also has problems. It is much easier to explain the replacement of τάδε by κακά in 717 if κακά stood at the end of 718, but on his view the original text of 718 contained καλά, and this had therefore to be corrupted to κακά before the corrupted word could exert an influence on the previous line. This is possible (stranger things have happened) but it seems a stretch. Nevertheless I have adopted it instead of the paradosis, which I think is impossible.

It may be worthwhile to consider an alternative approach. The phrase ἐπῄνεσ' αἰδῶ ought to mean 'I thank you for your consideration': cf. 53 and *HF* 1235. In which case it should be followed by at least a raised period. I suggest

Τα. οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως σοι ῥᾳδίως εἴπω κακά.
Αν. ἐπῄνεσ' αἰδῶ· πλὴν ἐὰν λέγῃς, λέγε.

For this use of πλήν, cf. *Ba*. 1039.

914-8

Ελ. ἴσως με, κἂν εὖ κἂν κακῶς δόξω λέγειν,
οὐκ ἀνταμείψῃ πολεμίαν ἡγούμενος.
ἐγὼ δ', ἅ σ' οἶμαι διὰ λόγων ἰόντ' ἐμοῦ
κατηγορήσειν, ἀντιθεῖσ' ἀμείψομαι
[τοῖς σοῖσι τἀμὰ καὶ τὰ σ' αἰτιάματα].

918 del. Paley, neque agnoscit Σ ut vid.

918 is awkward, and D. adopts Paley's deletion. But in fact it is so awkward and so nonsensical that it could not have been written in its transmitted form. Interpolated lines, of course, can be corrupted just as genuine lines can, but it seems a bad practice to delete something until you know what its author intended. Furthermore, without the line ἀντιθεῖσ' is left without any construction or meaning. The verb means 'set against so as to balance' (LSJ), and it takes an accusative and either a dative or genitive. Paley's translation of his text shows what is wrong with it: 'But I will reply to the charges I expect you will bring against me if you enter into the discussion, by setting other charges against them'. Both the 'other charges' and the 'against *them*' have to be conjured out of thin air.

The problem with the transmitted text is that while τοῖς σοῖσι τἀμὰ corresponds exactly with what we expect as the objects of ἀντιθεῖσ', καὶ τὰ σὰ is nonsense. Herwerden's τοῖς σοῖσι τἀμὰ πάνδικ' αἰτιάματα gives exactly the sense we require, 'setting my just accusations against yours'. But for paleographical plausibility the palm goes to Pearson's τοῖς σοῖσι τἄμ' ἰσαίτατ' αἰτιάματα. In uncial hands IC is frequently read as K, and once τἄμ' ἰσαι- had been read as τἀμὰ καὶ the rest of the corruption (sigma for tau) would easily have followed. The superlative ἰσαίτατος is not found in extant Euripides, but the comparative ἰσαίτερον is attested at *Su.* 441.

1033-5

Μενέλαε, προγόνων τ' ἀξίως δόμων τε σῶν
τεῖσαι δάμαρτα κἀφελοῦ πρὸς Ἑλλάδος

ψόγον τὸ θῆλύ τ', εὐγενὴς ἐχθροῖς φανείς.

1035 τὸ θῆλυ, κεὐγενὴς . . . φανῇ Bothe, fort. recte: cf. 726, Med. 600, IA 1208, fr. 188.3

Hermann's translation of the transmitted text reads 'averte a te reprehensionem Graeciae et mores effeminatos'. D., *Studies*, pp. 68-70, supports the prepositional phrase dependent on an anarthrous noun by citing *Hcld.* 624, δόξα πρὸς ἀνθρώπων, and a number of other passages. But he finds ψόγον τὸ θῆλύ τ' difficult as a hendiadys. Furthermore, he finds the charage of effeminacy, though often leveled at Menelaus, not perfectly apposite here. This leads him to adopt Bothe's suggestion, which gives the sense 'remove from the female sex the criticism of Hellas'.

This has some attractions in view of the discussion of female behavior by Hecuba at 1031-2. But can ἀφαιρεῖσθαί τί τινα mean 'remove something (bad) from someone' instead of 'rob someone of something good'? LSJ's instances are all of taking for oneself something of value. Even more important, however, is the rhetorical irrelevance of this remark, as construed by D. He writes, 'In the speech which precedes these lines Hecuba ended by appealing to Menelaus to punish Helen and so set an example to *women*: νόμον δὲ τόνδε ταῖς ἄλλαισι θὲς / γυναιξὶ κτλ. It would follow with much more point if the chorus were to appeal to Menelaus to remove from *women* the blame which, because of Helen's conduct, Greece has heaped upon them'. But why should Menelaus care enough about how women are thought of to let this be a guiding consideration in the important decision whether or not to kill his wife? If the Chorus were addressing a woman and asking her to act in a way that would bring credit rather than disgrace upon their sex, that would be one thing. But Menelaus' motivation is likely to be entirely different. The lines D. cites above, in which Hecuba asks Menelaus to 'set an example' to women (or, more accurately, 'make an example' of Helen) are directed entirely to the male standpoint and have in view not improving how women are thought of but how they behave in their duties towards their husbands.

It may be that I am suffering from an attack of *mumpsimus*, but it seems to me that exactly what is needed is supplied by the wording

of the manuscripts: 'Menelaus, act worthily of your ancestors and your house in punishing your wife, remove from Greece the charge that you are not real men, showing yourself noble in the eyes of your adversaries [i.e. me]!' Here is an appeal that is likely to work. Ever since Menelaus' uxorious pursuit of the reprobate Helen, the Chorus-leader implies, people have said that Menelaus is unmanly. Punish Helen and show that it isn't true! Even your defeated enemies will applaud you.

1042-8

Ελ. μή, πρός σε γονάτων, τὴν νόσον τὴν τῶν θεῶν
προσθεὶς ἐμοὶ κτάνῃς με, συγγίγνωσκε δέ.
Εκ. μηδ' οὓς ἀπέκτειν' ἥδε συμμάχους προδῷς·
ἐγὼ πρὸ κείνων καὶ τέκνων σε λίσσομαι.
Με. παῦσαι, γεραιά· τῆσδε δ' οὐκ ἐφρόντισα.
λέγω δὲ προσπόλοισι πρὸς πρύμνας νεῶν
τήνδ' ἐκκομίζειν, ἔνθα ναυστολήσεται.

The μηδ' in 1044 seems odd. Hecuba's command is in opposition to Helen's, yet this connective would seem to make it a continuation of it. Could a line have dropped out before this verse? If 1044 were preceded by e.g. ⟨μέμνησ' ἅ σ' ᾔσχυν' ἥδε καὶ τοὺς σοὺς δόμους⟩, the μηδ' would make perfect sense. It true that Helen spoke two lines, and 1042-5 make a brief distochomythy. But nothing like a pattern gets established since Menelaus has three. Hecuba could well have had three herself.

1055-9

ἐλθοῦσα δ' Ἄργος ὥσπερ ἀξία κακῶς
κακὴ θανεῖται καὶ γυναιξὶ σωφρονεῖν
πάσαισι θήσει. ῥᾴδιον μὲν οὐ τόδε·
ὅμως δ' ὁ τῆσδ' ὄλεθρος ἐς φόβον βαλεῖ
τὸ μῶρον αὐτῶν, κἂν ἔτ' ὦσ' αἰσχίονες.

1059 αἰσχίονες Hermann et fort. Σ^{i} (ἀκόλαστοι πάνυ): ἐχθίονες VP

When καλός and αἰσχρός are applied to actions, they of course mean 'creditable' and 'discreditable' respectively. That is because an action can be 'beautiful' or 'ugly' only in a metaphorical sense. As applied to persons, they normally mean, in the physical sense, 'beautiful' and 'ugly', and I cannot find any instances where they have a moral reference. With Hermann's conjecture 1059 ought to mean 'even if they are still *uglier*'. This is obviously not the correct sense.

Transmitted ἐχθίονες gives what we need: immoral persons are often regarded as objects of hatred, and hatred of sexual misconduct is reflected in the vocabulary used to describe it. Thus μίσητος and μισητία mean 'lecherous, promiscuous' and 'lewdness' respectively. There is thus nothing surprising in Menelaus' 'even if they are even more hateful than they are'.

1083-8

ὦ φίλος ὦ πόσι μοι,
σὺ μὲν φθίμενος ἀλαίνεις
ἄθαπτος ἄνυδρος, ἐμὲ δὲ πόντιον σκάφος
αἴσσον πτεροῖσι πορεύσει
ἱππόβοτον Ἄργος, ἵνα ⟨τε⟩ τείχη
λάϊνα Κυκλώπι' οὐράνια νέμονται.

1086 ᾆισσον Hermann 1087 ⟨τε⟩ τείχη Seidler: τείχεα VP cf. Ph. 645, IA 1495, ad numeros Andr. 1204-5/1219

As his examples show, D. understands Seidler's insertion as epic τε. Epic τε seems a slightly more plausible interpretation of those two passages than connective τε (*pace* Mastronarde on *Pho.* 645 and 1751). Whether it should be introduced here by conjecture is another matter. D.'s metrical parallel suggests the analysis cr ith. But this is obtained by emending the antistrophe as well as the strophe. If we retain πολύδακρυν in 1105, treating it as period end with *brevis in longo*, we can analyse as 2ia. In the strophe read e.g. ἵν' ἐρύματα.

1091-9

Μᾶτερ, ὤμοι, μόναν δή μ' Ἀχαιοὶ κομί-
ζουσι σέθεν ἀπ' ὀμμάτων
κυανέαν ἐπὶ ναῦν,
εἰναλίαισι πλάταις
ἢ Σαλαμῖν' ἱερὰν
ἢ δίπορον κορυφὰν
Ἴσθμιον, ἔνθα πύλας
Πέλοπος ἔχουσιν ἕδραι.

Since κυανέαν ἐπὶ ναῦν cannot mean 'on their dark ship' (contrast ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, over the surface of the sea), it has got to mean 'to their dark ship'. But then to introduce the idea of the next (seaborne) stage of the journey we need Musgrave's εἶθ' ἁλίαισι.

1173-7

δύστηνε, κρατὸς ὥς σ' ἔκειρεν ἀθλίως
τείχη πατρῷα, Λοξίου πυργώματα,
ὃν πόλλ' ἐκήπευσ' ἡ τεκοῦσα βόστρυχον
φιλήμασίν τ' ἔδωκεν, ἔνθεν ἐκγελᾷ
ὀστέων ῥαγέντων φόνος, ἵν' αἰσχρὰ μὴ στέγω.

1177 στέγω Diggle: λέγω VPΣ et Athen. et Eust. in Il. p. 757.47, quo servato δὴ pro μὴ Denniston

I'm not entirely happy with D.'s στέγω. This addresses a problem, but I am not sure that it is the best solution. The problem it addresses is that Hecuba does not fail to speak of the ugly things. But the language she uses is not so blunt as to justify her in saying 'not to conceal ugly things'. For one thing, ἐκγελᾷ relieves some of the bitterness of the description. This is a striking metaphor. Perhaps that is what she is alluding to with her purpose clause and Euripides wrote ἵν' ἐχθρὰ μὴ λέγω, 'so that I might not describe it as hateful'. The corruption is illustrated by the manuscript variants at *Alc.* 1037.

1240-1

Εκ. †οὐκ ἦν ἄρ’ ἐν θεοῖσι† πλὴν οὑμοὶ πόνοι
Τροία τε πόλεων ἔκκριτον μισουμένη, κτλ.

The sense we look for is ‘The gods, it seems, had nothing in view except my misery and their hatred of Troy beyond all other cities’. Perhaps all we need is to insinuate an οὐδέν: οὐκ ἦν ἄρ’ ⟨οὐδ⟩ὲν θεοῖσι. Or perhaps there is a lacuna after 1240.

INDICES

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

adnominal genitive, anarthrous, position of: 50, 142
ambiguous language: 7-8
'as it seems' with negatived statement: 15
assimilation to case of neighboring word: 36
brachylogy: 113
Dionysus a new god whose worship is ancient: 114, 119
distichomythia: 9
Erinyes, number of: 177
extra-dramatic reference: 44
gloss extrudes original: 25
Greeks / barbarians an exhaustive dichotomy: 178
haplography: 96
heroes, burial of: 158-60
hyperbaton: 151
interference of neighboring line: 18-9, 51
interpolation: 9, 11-2, 26-7, 30, 31-2, 35, 36, 41, 50-1, 70, 87, 88-9, 181
lacunae: 4-5, 8-9, 14, 23, 33, 39-40, 46, 71, 83, 84-6, 120, 122, 135, 136, 137, 147, 171, 174, 176, 180, 185, 188
lines from other plays repeated: 9
meter
    lyric: 15-6, 37, 132, 134, 149, 152, 173, 186
    spoken: 67-8, 70, 105, 142, 146
money and traditional values: 59-60, 65-6
'pankoinon' or truism: 7
plural verb with singular participle: 116
sense pause before final iamb of trimeter: 13, 50
sententiousness in anonymous characters: 41
Sirius (the Dog Star): 139-41
speaker changes wrongly transmitted: 120
staging
    eisodoi, use of left and right: 79-82, 95, 108, 124, 163-4
    'jack-in-the-box' entrance: 98
    leaping entrance: 99-101
    unseen newsbearers: 102-3
stanza end and speaker change in *amoebaea*: 136, 179
stichomythia: 9
synizesis: 27
Taplin's Law: 44
Time the revealer: 17-8
transpositions of lines: 10-1, 21-2, 47-8, 120
tyranny, attitudes toward: 63-5
voyeurism of Pentheus: 127-30, 133
winds and windlessness at Aulis: 141

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

αἰσχρός and καλός, applied to persons: 186
ἅλς/ ἅλες: 152
ἄν, position of: 126
ἀριθμέω: 32-3
δύσχορτος: 6
ἐάν, 'if haply': 4-5, 77-8; length of second syllable: 128
ἐάω plus infinitive, 'omit': 162
εἶεν: 144
ἐξαιρέω: 60
ἐπειδάν / ἐπεὶ δ' ἄν: 148
ἐπικλώθω: 77
ἐρεῖ τις vel sim. in mid speech: 120
εὖ, 'thoroughly': 57
κατάρχομαι: 1
κατέρχομαι: 3
κερτομέω: 45
ποῖ: 4
ὅδε in apposition with τίς: 4
οἱ (οἷ), 'sibi' vel 'ei': 87
ὅς, 'suus': 4
οὐδέν, 'for no reason': 16
οὔκουν: 117

παστάς: 100
πείθω: 52
σέλας: 157
σχιστὴ ὁδός: 53
σύγχορτος: 6
τε (epic): 186
τὸ σοφόν: 131
τοὔμπαλιν: 30
ὑβρίζω: 41
φύω with genitive: 13
ὧδε, position after an adjective: 75, 135
ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν: 75

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

Aeschylus
Ag. 637: 50; 1493: 166
Cho. 838: 24; 1008: 166
Eu. 914-5: 62
Pers. 173-4: 74; 223: 30; 714: 75; 742: 12
Sept. 734: 148
Su. 230: 142
fr. 204c4: 157; 387a: 54; 395: 12
Alcaeus, fr. 326: 121
[Apollonius of Athens] 3.10.1: 14
Aristophanes
Thesmo. 855-7: 24-5
Bacchylides 11.26 and 11.96: 172
Chaeremon, fr. 17.2: 24
Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 4.63: 73
Diodorus Siculus 4.27: 14
Euripides
Alc. 548: 57; 795-6: 51; 954: 120
Andr. 79: 57; 447: 37; 496: 143; 810: 51; 874-5: 15; 878: 51; 1151: 51; 1161-5: 41
Ba. 333-4: 15; 530-2: 151; 568: 172; 615: 57
Cy. 237: 57
El. 86: 157; 360: 51; 694: 57; 1170-1: 98
Hec. 313: 120; 490: 51; 504: 51; 967: 51; 990: 116; 1089-93: 109; 1114-5: 116
Hel. 416: 51; 712: 57; 759: 126; 771: 51; 1008: 51; 1197: 51; 1208: 166
HF 64: 43; 302-3: 4; 368: 172; 616: 57; 755-6: 98
Hcld. 69-72: 109; 167: 75; 460: 126; 624: 184
Hi. 504: 57; 589: 37; 776-7: 109; 884: 109; 1055: 57; 1069: 37; 1162: 76; 1249-54: 41; 1265-6: 41; 1367-9: 172
Ion 328: 57; 956: 57; 1069-72: 151
IT 35-6: 77; 128-42: 173; 349: 51; 532-4: 142; 650: 166; 1121-2: 125; 1155: 51
Med. 87: 51; 146: 166; 785: 51; 1116-7: 78; 1221: 51
Or. 217: 116; 429: 57; 665: 120; 1056: 57; 1311-2: 78; 1394: 51
Pho. 11: 51; 200-1: 87; 387: 51; 396: 142; 404: 57; 436; 51; 548: 51; 580: 120; 991: 57; 1364: 78; 1483: 166; 1620: 135
Rhes. 838: 52
Su. 124: 126; 314: 120; 383-94: 69; 655: 142; 1145: 136
Tro. 591: 136; 810: 172; 1105-6: 24; 1167: 116; 1255: 166
fr. 11: 166; 583: 131; 443.1: 157
Hesiod, *Th.* 265: 172
Homer
Il. 2.144-5: 24; 9.567: 151; 11.326-7: 151; 16.511-2: 151; 21.195: 172; 21.281: 166
Od. 5.313: 166; 11.412: 166; 14.257: 172; 15.359: 166; 22.462: 166; 24.34: 166
Pausanias 10.5.3-4: 54
Philodemus, *de pietate*: 13
Pindar, *Pyth.* 3.20-3: 126; 3.42: 166; *Isthm.* 7.42-8: 126
Plato, *Prot.* 320e3: 34
Sophocles
Ant. 829: 142
El. 23: 116; 958: 24; 1411-2: 98
OC 476: 144
OT 58: 24; 716: 54; 730: 54; 733-4: 54; 800-1: 53; 1023-4: 52; 1143: 74

Tr. 707: 24
fr. 86: 114; 546: 174; 562: 151
Statius, *Theb.* 1.326-8: 59
Strabo 9.5.18: 146
Strattis, *Phoen.* fr. 48: 62
Theocritus 15.107: 142